The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

It is December 1st. November, even with its appalling slaughter, has been a good month, for it has brought us in sight—let us be optimistic—of the beginning of the end. For the first time since the War began the United Nations have assumed the initiative, and there have been heartening victories on all fronts. Hitler and Mussolini must have terrifying thoughts, and the truth that defeat is certain must gradually be percolating through to their deluded peoples. There must, however, be no slackening of resolve, and all sniping of one ally by another should cease: anything that tends in the slightest degree to cause misunderstanding between the four United Nations should be visited with the severest condemnation. Those who listen to Axis propaganda, even to the egregious Haw-haw, know how incessantly it endeavours to sow dissension and suspicion between the Allies. We have heard dignitaries of the Church sometimes talk about Russia in a most shabby and shameful way considering all that Russia is suffering and remembering all that from which Russia has saved us. Nobody is asked to defend all that has happened in Russia—religious persecution and the like. But surely there is now a chance to make co-operation between the countries so wholehearted, the understanding so perfect, that the leaders of the Russian people will be willing to listen, say to President Roosevelt, when he speaks of religious freedom. And there are things too that we could hear from Russia to our advantage.

Mrs. Roosevelt's visit to Britain was a great success, and if China's First Lady can come she will receive a great welcome. The right people, moving from one nation to another, can do much to increase understanding now and prepare for the new world when the war is over.

* * *

We are grateful to all those readers who have taken the trouble to write expressing interest in the increase of the circulation of our journal and saying kind things about our own association with it. One enthusiast—not a Congregationalist—sent a subscription for two years on condition that the present editor remained in office for five years! The publishers accepted the subscription; the editor gave no guarantee. Even more moving was the action of a minister—a Congregationalist this time—who sent the names of six

of his hard-pressed brethren to whom the journal was to be sent for a year at his expense. When the time does come for us to lay down our task we shall cherish such incidents, even as we shall try to forget the minister—with a stipend twice that of the one just mentioned—who, immediately after publication day each quarter, used to make his way to the Book Room of Independent Press, and spend several hours in the perusal of the new number! Over such regular readers we cannot enthuse, though we confess to considerable satisfaction on seeing an old gentleman arrive in the Book Room last month; he seated himself on one of the specimen chairs, took out a bottle of ink, and proceeded to take notes from our last issue at his leisure.

Relief from war-time anxiety in regard to our journal would be removed if two to three hundred of those reading these words would secure an additional subscriber each for 1943. Please send their names to Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4. 10s. a year post free.

* * *

"THE greatest scandal of the nineteenth century is that the Church has lost the working classes". Who said that? Not some jaundiced critic of the Church, but Pope Leo XIII. And though the twentieth century has almost reached the half-way mark, the working classes are still lost: they are outside the Church—Roman, Orthodox, Protestant, the Friends, and even the Salvation Army. A Church which has lost both the working classes and youth has certainly its work cut out. And while it tinkers with its obsolete machinery and forgets the might and power of the ever-living God it will continue to fail. A new Pentecost is the first need if the Church is to build a new world.

And who spoke of "the unjust claims of capital" demanding "all the products and profits", and leaving to the workman "the barest minimum necessary to repair his strength and to ensure the continuation of his class [so that] all accumulation of riches must fall to the share of the wealthy, while the working man must remain perpetually in indigence"? No, it was not some Red Archbishop speaking in the Albert Hall in 1942. It was Pope Pius XI in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* in 1931. Whatever is the Church coming to? Popes and Archbishops speaking of capital and property, and championing the rights of working-men. "Things have come to a pretty pass" say the Melbournes and the Blimps of today. But there is the sound of a going in the tops of the trees.

And here, from modern fiction, is the working-man's call to the Church. Clive Briggs in Mr. Eric Knight's *This Above All* says to the clergyman:

> Follow Christ once more! Have done with your ridiculous version of sin, with your pomp and liturgy! Rise up from your sheer terror of the privileged! Come back into our lives as we live them today; fear them today; fight through them today.
>
> For if you did those things you would not need to ask us to come back to your church. We did not leave you. You left us. It may not be too late. We are waiting, nearly forty millions of us in this land, for you to give the church back to us.

* * *

MR. E. L. WOODWARD, in his stimulating autobiography, *Short Journey*, emphasizes the fact that a revolution is needed, but it is "a revolution in our attitude of mind towards scientific knowledge", for so many people have not begun to consider the implications of the "economics of plenty" and do not realize

> that we have within our reach the means of improving beyond any dream of past thinkers the standards of human life and also the quality of human beings.

He quotes Sir Alfred Zimmern on the mentality of the Nazis:

> In the full tide of the age of Abundance and Interdependence they use the language of the long ages of Drudgery, Penury, and Isolation. Power for them still means the power of man over man rather than the power of man over Nature.

But it is not only the Nazis. In every country, including the democracies, there are those who think their possessions, their security, are endangered if their neighbours are improving their lot. Here is the part the Churches can play in a "planned economy"—make men realize that they are members of a family, and that there is sufficient for all, including the millions of China and India, Russia and Japan.

* * *

THE Pope forty years ago, the Archbishop of Canterbury today, the leaders of the Churches in various ways, have declared themselves in favour of a fairer state of society, and have declared themselves champions of those whom it is the fashion in America to call "the underprivileged". And the heads of the American and British peoples have put on record in the Atlantic Charter that one of the aims of the United Nations is "that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want". One advantage of this aim is the simplicity with which it is phrased —with only one word of more than one syllable. Cannot the Churches emblazon these words on their banner? Perhaps. But can they persuade their members to implement them? It means that no man may have luxuries while any man lacks necessities. The trouble is that men always consider their own standard of life on this side of luxury, and that of their slightly wealthier neighbours on the other. How many Christians in the years between the wars in the democratic nations voluntarily reduced their

standard of living? A car, a month's holiday each year, a theatre once a month, a cinema once a week, a sealskin coat, a wireless set, a subscription to a cricket club, a daily cigar, one maid or two or three—are these necessities, or are they luxuries which Christians must forgo? What is the limit of capital a Christian may hold, of income he may expend?

Is it not a fact that there are many wealthy Christians, who contribute largely to the churches to which they belong and subscribe to many good causes, who resent *any* proposals which would limit their profits, diminish their income, or alter their standard of life? From the correspondence in the newspapers recently it would certainly seem so. And yet these people are unselfish in their personal relationships and often overflowing with human kindness. Sometimes they are just thoughtless, sometimes intellectually incapable of realizing the condition of people in the world around them. Last spring we heard an American, a Christian of high standing and a pacifist, say, "I really don't know how we shall manage at our summer home with the tire situation". The speaker little realized how shocking this sounded to an Englishman who had seen thousands of homes shattered to bits, their occupants having lost everything even if they had escaped with their lives. *"All the men in all the lands"*. Does this mean that no Christian should live in comfort on the return from gilt-edged investments while there are men who are unemployed or living under the shadow of insecure employment? Does it mean that no Christian in the democracies can receive £5,000 a year while men in India and China live on a shilling a week? We have known Christian Socialists who lived on £2,000 a year, and "did themselves very well", and to us it seemed altogether inconsistent. But in lesser degree many of us are guilty of the same practices. We secure for ourselves a measure of comfort and protection for the future which is entirely beyond the reach of "all the men in all the lands", and we do not think we are doing wrong. But where and how is the line to be drawn? Popes and Archbishops, Free Church leaders and Quaker industrialists, must go forward from the statement of general principles to their practical application, and at the same time educate their magnates, clerical and lay, and prepare them for what lies ahead.

* * *

In a striking little book, noticed elsewhere, the Rev. R. A. Edwards shows the change from the Middle Ages, when the world listened to the Church, to the Reformation, the Victorian age of progress and rationalism, and the present day, when the Church counts for so little. The new learning, the emergence of nationalism, the age of discoveries, found the Church immersed in its own affairs, and it woke up to find

all manner of activities—art, science, education, commerce, let alone statecraft, which the Church had once controlled—were now passing very rapidly into lay hands.

"While thy servant was busy here and there he was gone"; while the Church, says Mr. Edwards, was deeply involved with questions about Holy Communion, ordination, confession, the respect due to the saints, an astonishing and difficult new world was being born, in which the Church was too occupied to find a place.

The process continued for centuries, and then in our time the world crashed. Has the Church still its eyes on its own concerns, and will it awake to find that in another new world it has no place at all?

A young Anglican, the Rev. Joseph McCulloch, is confident about the answer. In *The Faith That Must Offend* (Hodder, 6s.) he rules out the Church altogether as an instrument for winning Mr. Bull back to what he calls a natural faith. He says:

> One of the reasons why the Churches do not help Mr. Bull, and therefore do not satisfy me, is not because the Christian Faith is uncreative, but because the Churches' words are uncreative.

He quotes a devoted parish priest twenty-five years older than himself who, though he does his work bravely and faithfully, has written in despair about the future of Christianity. From the beginning of the century, when the Churches held "a secure and respected place" in the life of Britain, he has watched the devil take one strong point after another, until in 1942 "a tiny garrison holds out against overwhelming opposition and is bound to go down fighting".

Mr. McCulloch says the mistake made by his correspondent is that, coming from a stable age when the Church's work was primarily pastoral, he has failed to see that the day of the parochial pastoral Church is over:

> For the last thirty years we have needed a missionary militant Church—not a Church of isolated priests fighting lone battles in little pockets of resistance, but one of missionaries in a pagan world, organizing a concerted offensive.

He himself belongs to a generation which found, not a stable, well-ordered Church, where the clergyman counted, but an institution in a state of transition where the clergyman has ceased to count. "Reverend" has become "Rev.", and Sunday best has become flannel bags.

> For the devil now does not care a rap for the twentieth-century Church. In his propaganda he has for some time ignored it. He is clever enough to have made the merest mention of the Church in Mr. Bull's ears so much flogging of a dead horse.

Mr. McCulloch's description of Mr. Bull's attitude to religion is confident and, we believe, accurate on the whole. And he is, of course, right in his demand for an aggressive, militant Christianity, "a faith that must offend". We do not quite understand what he means, however, in asking for a natural faith and saying that we must cease to use words like "spiritual" until we know what they mean.

Surely, too, this earnest young padre is on the wrong tack in announcing so confidently that no help from the Church is forthcoming in the campaign to win men for the Kingdom. Let all that he says about the Church's failure in our time be granted; that does not mean that reformation and revival are impossible. Mr. McCulloch seems to have no historical sense; he forgets the work of Luther and Calvin and the Wesleys. The Church, we agree and have steadily proclaimed, must free herself from ancient machinery and be prepared to adopt new methods for new times, but there is still sufficient faith, and sufficient of the courage which Mr. McCulloch deems the first essential, to make the Church the power of God unto salvation. The Church of God is not any of the Churches we know—Mr. McCulloch almost identifies it with the Church of England: it is something both wider and deeper. There is such a thing as the Invisible Church, about which Mr. McCulloch does not seem to have heard: and that Church will find its outward expression in new forms, and its Lord will add to it day by day those who are being saved.

When this has been said, it may thankfully be recognized that books like those of these Anglican clergymen are encouraging signs. Critics of the Church from without are many, and often they speak out of much ignorance. But when those who love the Church, those who spend themselves in the Church's service, call the Church to repentance for its sloth and timidity, their words are to be heeded. Before the Church can be powerful it must be penitent, and we believe that already there are new signs of power which spring from confession of failure.

* * *

And it is not only Anglicans who are showing concern about the position of the Church in the world, though Free Churchmen would be wise to ponder the statement Dr. E. L. Allen makes in an article within—that leadership in the witness of the Church has passed from the Cliffords and the Hornes to the Bishops. A good deal of hard and painful thinking is going on in Congregational circles: not all Congregational ministers are content to preach to congregations of a hundred in buildings where their Victorian predecessors preached to a thousand. There is much searching of heart, and this is the first essential if there is to be a new start. The London Con-

gregational Union administered a shock to itself and its constituency when it frankly reported on a questionnaire to men and women in the Forces:

> *Question* 1. Practically all the replies agree that the general attitude of the Forces to religion is that of indifference. There is little hostility, but there is no sense that religion is either important or that it is relevant to life as it has to be lived. Several of our correspondents suggest that this indifference is partly a matter of ignorance, but what is disturbing is the absence of any sense of the importance or relevance of Jesus. It is not too much to say that apparently Jesus has almost faded out of the mind of the average soldier, and this goes far beyond anything that was reported in *The Army and Religion* published towards the end of the last war.
>
> One-third of the correspondents declared that the war made their religious life seem irrelevant and unreal. Most of them speak of the progressively deadening influence of Army life on mind and spirit, and note the absence of any serious discussion whatsoever. When discussions take place, however, by far the greater part of it centres around social issues, such as the post-war world, *etc.* In three cases sex is declared to be the main topic of discussion, and the war ranks with it in point of frequency.

The Committee make this comment:

> To put it bluntly we have failed to capture and hold the post-war generation, and there is no question to which the Church should seek an answer more earnestly than the simple question "Why?" Is it because this is essentially a Godless generation, and these are the days of sinful spiritual blindness and of absorption in material concerns? Is it because somehow the Churches and the world have drifted into a wrong psychological attitude one to another, so that the world is inclined to look upon the Church as a moral policeman rather than as a sure and abiding friend? Is it that unconsciously a new mood, a new outlook, and new needs have arisen in the modern world, whilst the Church has addressed itself to an outlook and to needs embodied in the historic Christian tradition and approach, so that the world has by-passed the Church and its faith, because the faith no longer seems relevant to life as the modern man has to live it?

The Warwickshire County Union has published a Statement, *Congregational Reconstruction: Spiritual Principles and Present-Day Implications,* which deserves careful study. On all sides we hear of groups in individual churches or from a number of churches considering social justice, the economic set-up after the war, the nature of the peace, and the shape of things to come: *The Better World* (Chesterfield: Bales & Wilde, 3d.) is the report of one such group.

* * *

WAS ever more attention directed to the future of education? All the political parties have prepared Reports, sometimes to their own consternation, and it will be interesting to see the result. Not yet has the Fisher Act of 1918 been implemented, and we need its Nursery Schools and Day Continuation Schools before we can go forward.

Much of the attention has been focused on the question of religious education in elementary schools. First the Nonconformists failed in their effort to provide schools where the State should have no responsibility for the teaching of religion; and the Church of England has almost come to the conclusion that the financial burden is too much for it too. The Board of Education itself, and all kinds of groups, some representative, some unofficial, have shown interest in the situation; and proposals, suggestions, kites, negotiations, *pourparlers*, and a hundred and one other activities, with the shadow of Dr. Scott Lidgett ever moving in the background, are the order of the day.

At first it looked as if the dual system would disappear, and in its place would be one type of school, with an agreed syllabus or agreed syllabuses of religious teaching. The Church of England though it has moved a long way, is not yet prepared to go that far; it desires to retain at least some of its schools. The Roman Catholics are intransigeant, and while they insist on "Catholic teaching by Catholic teachers in Catholic schools"—at public expense—a single system is impossible. Assuming, apart from the Roman Catholics, that agreement can be reached, two questions arise—what is to be taught, and who are to be the teachers? Is it possible to prepare a syllabus that will suit at the same time the Bishop of Oxford and Canon Major, the Methodist Evangelical and the highly trained schoolmaster? In his *Change Here for Britain*, where many urgent problems find their solution in a paragraph, the Rev. Cecil Northcott rushes in to say:

> Let no one imagine that the solution is simple, or that plain Bible teaching in the schools is the way out. It is the Christian faith that must be taught historically and dogmatically, and that teaching can best be given by teachers who themselves have seen and heard of Him and believe.

We often wonder what *plain* Bible teaching is. Apparently it is not "the Christian faith". What then is to be added to the Bible? Who shall decide? Mr. Northcott? Or Dr. Whale? Or Mr. Bulcock? Can agreement be found in any one denomination, to say nothing of them all? And, whatever it is, it must be taught "historically and dogmatically". Is not this a contradiction in terms? We should like to hear a teacher teaching a class of eight-year-olds "historically and dogmatically"—no, on second thoughts we shouldn't.

Mr. Northcott is on surer ground when he mentions the teachers —"genuine and competent" were the qualities Archbishop Davidson used to desiderate. Where shall such be found in sufficient numbers? The question of their training is already most urgent. Are the Churches equipped to tackle it?

* * *

THE present interest in religious education has brought many inquiries about parallel developments in the United States. Through the kindness of Dr. Erwin L. Shaver, Director of Weekday Religious Education, Chicago, we have received a packet of literature from which we have extracted the following facts. First we draw on a pamphlet, *Public Education and Religion,* by Dr. Luther A. Weigle, Dean of Yale Divinity School. America is a land of religious freedom, and the Church is separated from the State, but a land which recognizes "public responsibility for education for citizenship in a democracy". Through the years America has drifted into the separation of religion from education for a variety of reasons, including (a) the sectarianism of religious organizations, (b) the growing centralization of education, (c) the growth of knowledge, (d) the Sunday School movement, (e) the revivalism of American Protestantism. There has thus been a general disposition to accept the exclusion of religion from the public schools as a closed question.

Nevertheless, America has a common religious faith in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jew share. "The American government favors no sect, and fosters no sectarianism; but it protects religion". The separation of Church from State means that both are mutually free. It does not mean or imply the complete separation of the State from religion. Indeed, the constitutions of 42 out of 48 of the States contain explicit expressions of faith in God. The religious faith of the American people is expressed in various public acts and customs:

> The common religious faith of the American people, as distinguished from the sectarian forms in which it is organized, may rightfully be assumed and find appropriate expression in the life and work of the public schools.

In most States the public schools [in the American sense, of course, not the British] have Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer; Bible reading is required by statute in 11 States, specifically permitted in 5, construed as lawful in 20, and regarded as unlawful only in 12.

> As a means of education in religion, the value of the practice of opening the public school with a brief period of devotion, including the reading of a selection from the Bible and the recital of the Lord's Prayer, is slight. But as a means of keeping religion in education, this custom, which is as old as the American public school, is well worth keeping. It is an

act of reverence, an acknowledgment of the God from whom all life proceeds, and a recognition of the rightful place of religion in human affairs. By a careful selection of materials, making use of Catholic and Jewish as well as Protestant versions of the Scriptures, it may be divested of sectarian elements and be made expressive of our common faith.

The Wisconsin decision of 1890, declaring the Bible to be a sectarian book, has been so often quoted that we tend to forget that it is not the last word on the subject, that it is binding only within the state for which it was made, and that the great majority of the State Supreme Court decisions are not in agreement with it. Twelve such decisions are contrary to the position of the Wisconsin court, and three only in accord with it.

Sectarian teaching and influence must be scrupulously avoided, and parents who object must be allowed to withdraw their children. But to omit religion from the public schools is to convey to children a negative suggestion. As President Nicholas Murray Butler has pointed out:

> So far as tax-supported schools are concerned, an odd situation has been permitted to arise. The separation of church and state is fundamental in our American political order, but so far as religious instruction is concerned, this principle has been so far departed from as to put the whole force and influence of the tax-supported school on the side of one element of the population, namely, that which is pagan and believes in no religion whatsoever.

Dean Weigle concludes:

> For the State even tacitly to deny religion in its schools would be to impair the religious liberty of that vast majority of American citizens who believe in God and desire that the education of their children give proper place to religious belief.

He seems therefore—and we are told he is supported by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, of the *Christian Century*, and Prof. F. Ernest Johnson of Columbia University—to be in favour of the teaching of religion in the public schools by public school teachers at the public expense, and urges that it is imperative, therefore, that Protestants, Catholics, and Jews should reach a common understanding; thus they will be able "to make possible a total educational program that will include religious faith".

Meanwhile the problem has been approached in another way. The plan for the "Release of Public School Pupils for Religious Instruction" was begun at Gary, Ind., in 1913. It has since been adopted by 488 school systems in 1,000 communities scattered over 38 States. "Release" becomes "Dismissal" if the religious instruction is at the end of the school day. From the legal standpoint 9 States (and 2 Territories) specifically permit release, 3 allow

release to attend Confirmation Classes, 1 release to High School pupils only. A number of States forbid release, but the majority leave the decision to local authorities. A weekday church school is

> a school set up by the churches singly or in co-operation, in which the attending pupils are "released" or "dismissed" from their usual public school program, at the written request of parents, to go to the church or other building (or in some cases to remain in the public school building) to receive religious education.

These schools, it must be noted, are *not* part of the public school system; the public school authorities have no control, and public money is not expended; they merely use public school time. The church schools are run by single churches or a group of churches; where the public school building is used, payment is made for heating, lighting, *etc.* Professionally trained teachers are used wherever possible, and the use of clergy, unaccustomed and maybe unqualified to teach, is not recommended. The cost works out at $2.00 to $6.00 per year per pupil (*cf.* the $75.00 for the cost of public school education). The teaching does not duplicate that of Sunday Schools, and it is correlated wherever possible with the public school curriculum. At first the Roman Catholics were inclined to regard the system as a "Protestant experiment", but they are now said to favour it and to be eager to use it for all children for whom they have not their own parochial schools. [At the moment we have been unable to obtain statistics of the number of these parochial schools.]

The Campaign for the "Release" plan has many things in common with the present plea for religious teaching in England and Wales. Its slogan is "A United Advance in Christian Education to reach Every Person with Christian Teaching". It appeals to the Churches to unite to meet the present emergency and to face the facts. It maintains:

> While we know that the foundations of democracy are moral and spiritual—
>
> Millions leave God out of their lives entirely.
> Half our youth grow up in ignorance of Christian teaching.
> Our crime bill is six times our investments in education.
> The majority of our homes shirk their responsibility for Christian nurture.
> A secure and decent world cannot be achieved without God.
>
> While more than twenty millions attend our church schools—
>
> As many more remain untaught.
> Growth in attendance hardly keeps pace with population increase.

Churches working separately are losing ground in many communities.
Parents need more definite help in fulfilling their teaching responsibilities.
Program improvement is needed in many churches.

* * *

It is never wise to determine on your stroke before the ball is delivered—that is why so many youngsters are out the very next ball after hitting a six! We have to confess that we made this mistake with Dr. Gilbert Laws's *Andrew Fuller* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.). Knowing Dr. Laws to be a man of clear head and warm heart, and Andrew Fuller to be a good subject, phrases for a short notice containing the words "competent" and "inspiring" began to form in our minds before opening the book. We were compelled to ask so many questions, however, that it will not allow itself to be treated thus, even though the epithets may stand. Not only must we comment on the new name for Sir Robert Walpole, and Dr. Laws's manner—after that of 19th century novelists—of making sententious comments on his characters as he writes, but more serious points constrain attention. What, *e.g.*, are we to make of sentences like these?

> Other Christians soon began to notice the earnest lad and invited him to their prayer meetings, where he took part in prayer and other religious exercises. How modern this sounds!
>
> Fuller heard none of the appeals for decision from the pulpit to which we are accustomed at the present day.

Prayer meetings modern? Is it not a deplorable fact that prayer meetings in many churches are entirely unknown? Is it not true that in all the Free Churches the number of members willing to "lead in prayer" is fewer than at any time for a hundred years?

"Appeals for decision . . . at the present day"? How many readers of these papers under thirty-five years of age ever heard one or ever attended a prayer meeting? Is Dr. Laws writing of the days of his youth, we wonder, or does he live in a religious atmosphere unknown to most modern British Christians? Frequently one of the most distinguished and devoted women in the Salvation Army used to worship in a Congregational Chapel near the Congress Hall on Sunday evenings. Often she made her way to the minister's vestry, and invariably her comment followed the same lines—appreciation of the service, and then:

> But, you know, it lacked one thing. You should have made a definite appeal for decision. No service ought to be without it.

She succeeded in leaving the minister uncomfortably wondering whether, in his fear of emotionalism and his exaggerated respect for the rights of individual personality, he had missed opportunities

to win people for his Master. We are sure Dr. Laws is wrong in thinking such appeals now common; we are by no means sure that preachers have not erred in failing more often to challenge their hearers to a decision.

We are obliged to cross swords with Dr. Laws on a point perhaps of even greater importance. He quotes Fuller's words:

> I was aware of the danger of being drawn into any acquaintance with the other sex, which might prove injurious to my spiritual welfare. . . . But amidst my youthful follies and sins, I bless God that I was always kept from any unbecoming freedoms, or attempting to engage the affections of any female, except with a view to marriage.

So far so good, allowing for the 18th century language. But then the 20th century preacher comments:

> From the sin which, above all others, scorches and sears the soul, Fuller, through mercy, needed no rescue.

"Above all others". Now we have the historian's suspicion of all unqualified superlatives. For example, if a man say that the supreme act of Christian worship is the Mass, the sermon, or the silence, he is saying what he has neither right, nor authority, nor knowledge, to say. He has every right to say that "*For me* the supreme act of worship is the Mass, or sermon, or silence", but to generalize his own experience into a superlative is utterly *ultra vires*. And so is this expression of the Baptist biographer, an expression to which we cannot believe he gave adequate consideration.

With the historian's desire for authorities, we ask, How does Dr. Laws know, how can he know, that one type of sin "scorches and sears the soul . . . above all others"? We shall not be thought to minimize the guilt of "sins of the flesh" when we say that the Church has made no greater mistake than in isolating such sins and magnifying them "above all others". The strange thing is that the Church here has run counter to all that we know of the mind of Christ, and of the practice of the Jesus of the Gospels. *He* did not minimize sexual sins, but neither did He speak as if they were different from all others—He forgave the sinners, and rebuked their prurient accusers; *His* severest words were for sins of the mind and heart—pride, greed, hypocrisy. Let Dr. Laws read the "Woes", and denounce the "respectable" sins which his Lord denounced as well as others.

This is an age when the old sexual standards have disappeared. The Churches have to teach men again that their bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost, and to convince them that self-control, and even asceticism, can be parts of self-expression. But the new generation is not going to listen if, silent about avarice and acquisitiveness,

snobbery and bigotry, preachers talk in this way about "above all others": they will bring a counter-charge of lack of realism, and demand that churches cure their own people of the sins they are inclined to before they condemn other sinners. By all means let the Church fight against sin of all kinds, always loving and endeavouring to save the sinner (as with one type of sin she has sometimes forgotten to do), and invariably taking for guide the life and teaching of Jesus.

"If there is one thing that stands out clearly in the Synoptic account of Jesus", Dr. W. F. Lofthouse has recently written, "it is His burning indignation against cruelty, oppression, and callousness, whether in the Pharisee, the unforgiving debtor, or Dives". Dr. Laws would no doubt agree. Then why single out and emphasize another sin with superlative alliteration?

We commend to Dr. Laws the fierce and bitter speech in *This Above All* from which we have already quoted, in which Briggs claims to "say openly that which common men say among themselves in crueller words all over this land":

> And of all the sins Christ catalogued, you have found only one that does not repel the rich, because it is universal and has nothing to do with their being rich—sexual sin! And so you have made sex itself a sin. The original sin of Adam. Christ born without sin. . . . The only sin you preach! And then you wonder why the millions desert your church and worship at the truer temple of a poor love film at the cinema.

Fierce and bitter we called this harangue, which should be read in full. Exaggerated too. But with sufficient truth to challenge the Church to thought—and to repentance. Everything that meant treating a soul sacred in God's sight as less than a person Jesus denounced—everything, and not one thing only. Here, as always, we should learn of Him, and not pick and choose among sins we castigate.

* * *

Our conservatives must sometimes wonder what is happening to them. They repent their liberalism in sackcloth and ashes, repudiate their earlier writings, and castigate—perhaps even calumniate—themselves and the communions to which they belong —or belonged. And it is all in vain. The Rev. D. R. Davies, having arrived at conservative orthodoxy and the Church of England by way of Congregationalism and communism, finds himself thus rebuked—and not in the *Hibbert Journal* or in our own pages, but in *Theology:*

> When Mr. Davies goes on to pillory the proposition "Goodness is innate: evil is acquired" as a monstrous absurdity, he ranges himself not only against the whole body of Catholic theology but against Holy Scripture itself; the truth about

man revealed by God is that man *is* in his essential nature good, and that evil *was* acquired. . . . The reaction against "liberalism" has reached a point which makes it opportune to raise these issues explicitly.

* * *

LAST month we congratulated the Church of England in that it had learnt wisdom since it cast out John Wesley, and had retained Dick Sheppard and Bishop Hensley Henson, both troublers of Israel. Apparently we were premature, for *Midnight Hour* reveals the tragic story of how the Church has rejected from its ministry one who has had a spiritual experience it is safe to say ninety-nine per cent of its clergy have never known. A man of keen spiritual sensitivity and great intellectual gifts, Nicodemus was led to believe that he could best use his life by serving in a country parish in the Church of England. He therefore became a Lay Reader and prepared for Ordination. Meanwhile he was persuaded by a friend to allow an entry in his journal to appear in the *Christian News-Letter*. In this entry he frankly described the Church of England as he saw it; he spoke of his "unabated impatience with the sterility, 'stuffiness' and mere conservatism of the Church", and went on:

> I believe that our Church is, in the main, a dead Church, that it cleaves to the security and comfort of its coherence with a corrupt order of society which is itself moribund, the self-centred individualism and Mammon-worship of nineteenth-century civilization, with its iniquitous doctrines of the "profit-motive", "laissez-faire" and the "skin-game" of competition, that it all too often preaches an emasculate pietism and shirks the fact that it has now no spiritual dynamic to offer to man, that it is in the main, a compromising pseudo-Christianity. Its professionalism, its mere "churchiness", sicken me and the typical "parson" and his utterance and attitude fill me with despair. . . Finally, if I am honest with myself, I must confess that I do not see the first shoots, in this Church of England, of that resurrection of Christianity which I know to be at the birth. It seems to me far more probable that such a rebirth will come from the "Gentile" world, from India or from Russia, than from the Church of England. I believe that they who ally themselves with the Church of England ally themselves with death and go down in spirit to a grave of the spirit.

Nevertheless he was convinced in conscience that he must submit himself to the loyalty and discipline of the Church, and through it serve men:

> So the long conflict closes; I come home at last to the haven where I would be; the dream of forty years comes true. At last, after all, to be unconditionally Christ's man, able at last to preach Christ crucified, not as a career, not for pay, but for love, to offer the Word of life to all these "hungry sheep" (and

most of all these young ones whose calling tears my heart), to be God's "person" (not that dreary thing, a "personality"), to bear before His altar the sins and sorrows of one's own family of souls, to abide in His Holy Place, the "Innermost, where the flame is and the wings are throbbing"—how incredible, how shining a "port after stormie seas"! How small a price to "die daily", to "leave all that I have" (as, for a while I must—yet how satisfying there at last really to fulfil that law which has sounded for so long in my soul!)—how small a price for so great a prize! "Lord, I am not worthy".

The Church's response? For six weeks he served as a lay reader with great joy: then an "informer" revealed that he was the author of the extract in the *Christian News-Letter*, and four days before his ordination was due he was told it could not take place, and later that there was no hope of the ban being removed. The Church—and there is no assurance that the Free Churches would have acted in any other way—apparently does not desire mystics or prophets, those who have passed through deep spiritual waters or who are aware of the Church's shortcomings. The Church wants safe men, machine-minders, those who will mouth the old shibboleths and not be troublesome. Is it any wonder that the Church counts less and less in the life of men, and that already the first letters of the word "Ichabod" are written over the doors? Is it too late for those letters to be expunged? Will God continue to be patient with His Church, so slothful, so timid, so unbelieving?

* * *

Most readers of these pages have probably, in some way or another, been indebted to John Henry Muirhead, whose *Recollections* are noticed within. Muirhead was one of many scholars, contemporaries and juniors, who started life with a religious background but "emancipated" (he himself uses the word) themselves, and ceased to profess any religious faith or, apparently, to attend any religious worship. On most points Muirhead was "on the side of the angels", and we are inclined to doubt whether organized Christianity has squarely faced the problem that he and his like present. Mr. E. L. Woodward, of the next generation, whom we have just quoted, is another instance. Why is it that fine men, with culture and with records of altruistic service, fail to find anything helpful in Christian worship? Is it the failure of the Church to present the Christian faith adequately? Or is it the failure of Christians so to live that it is patent their faith makes a vital difference? Has Christianity ceased to out-think and out-live paganism, as was once claimed for it?

How many professing and practising Christians are there among the Dons in Oxford and Cambridge, and among the Pro-

fessors in the newer Universities? Is not the number appallingly small? And is the Church sufficiently concerned about it? We believe that the Christian faith commends itself to man's reason. If so, where does the blame lie when so many of those engaged in teaching act as though for them that faith did not count? Have our readers any light to throw on the subject?

* * *

TURNING the pages of *Bernard Shaw,* by that most unpleasant person, Frank Harris, we noticed that Shaw declared that Morell, the Socialist preacher in *Candida,* was "a portrait of Stopford Brooke with touches of Fleming Williams".

Fleming Williams! We hope that someone whose memory goes back to Fleming Williams's Aldermanic days on the L.C.C. has preserved for a new generation some account of one of London's most distinctive Congregationalists. Those who knew "Fleming" only through his frequent interventions in the discussions of the Congregational Council did not Williams know. He was one of the best conversationalists we have met; indeed report had it that Morgan Gibbon ceased to attend the local Ministers' Fraternal because there was a more scintillating star! In Fleming Williams's talk words seemed to fall naturally into epigrams. Unhappily he could not write as he talked; once when we persuaded him to put on paper for this journal [I. 415] some reminiscences of travels in Ireland during the "troubles" (but when haven't there been troubles in Ireland?) the sparkle somehow departed. What Fleming did for the people of London in days when ministerial intervention in politics was uncommon is in danger of being forgotten. We trust it has been recorded, and that, despite Hitler, the written word will remain.

* * *

A SEPTUAGENARIAN Congregationalist related the other day that in his youth he heard a sermon by Dr. Allon of which he remembered little but its length. *One* sentence, however, had always remained in his memory, and on it he had pondered often: "A man may starve, but he may not steal". We wonder how many Christians would reiterate that statement today.

* * *

THE REV. B. GREY GRIFFITH has started a game which will have many followers. He selects as his "Books that remain from 1904-09": Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology;* Forsyth, *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind;* Oman, *Vision and Authority;* Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion.* How many of our readers who are Mr. Griffith's contemporaries would make the same choice? And what would be their alternatives? The question is much easier to answer than the next that occurs to us, "What four

books in the same field will remain in 1980?" Here is a chance for those of the present generation who correspond to Dr. Selbie's "Minor Prophets".

* * *

SOUND counsel from William Ellery Channing, who died a hundred years ago:

> Error of opinion is an evil too trifling to be named in comparison with this practical departure from the gospel, with this proud, censorious, overbearing temper, which says to a large body of Christians, "Stand off, we are holier than you".

* * *

WE hope that the story told of the Bishop of Münster is true. He was denouncing in his cathedral Nazi interference with family life and religious duties when a young Nazi interrupted: "What right has a celibate to talk about the problems of youth and marriage?" Bishop Galen commanded silence and said, "Never will I tolerate in this cathedral any reflection upon our Führer!"

* * *

FROM John Henry Muirhead's *Reflections* we take the stories of

(*a*) a Japanese, being asked after attending a discussion of the Trinity what he thought of it, replied, "It is so like you English to have a committee for that also".

(*b*) Edward Caird when, in argument with a group of particularly obstinate opponents, who closed it by announcing, "Well, Sir, you will never convince us", replied, "No, I shan't convince you, but by Grace of God you will die out".

(*c*) the Macdonald who retorted to the Cameron's boast that his ancestors had been in the Ark by "the Macdonald had a boat of his own".

(*d*) Henry James, slipping on his cousin's parquet floor and "expressing himself in adequate language", asking pardon, and receiving the answer, "Oh, yes, Henry, by all means. It is the first intelligible word I have heard from you".

* * *

OUR publishers have received an advertising sheet from an American firm, which quotes a postcard from "a gentleman in New York City". It reads:

> You are wasting your catalogs on me. I am not a "Rev.", neither am I interested in 99 per cent of the books you offer; they'd bore me stiff, for I am an averagely intelligent Episcopalian.

* * *

NOWADAYS we cut our printing order to the bone, and so run out of print. We urgently need two copies of July, 1941, for our files.

THE CHURCHES AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

By Sir RICHARD ACLAND, Bart., M.P.

I AM asked, "What can the Christian Churches do now?"

I am not at all sure that I can give an answer in the sense that is expected of me. I may be mistaken, but I have the impression that there is implied in the question some such thought as this:

> The Christian Churches having found, in such publications as *Malvern and After* or *Towards a Christian Britain,* a line of approach which is, in general, a sufficient means of carrying their vital message to the British people, what positive action should they now take in order to "put this over"?

Unfortunately I cannot feel that the Christian Churches have as yet found the correct line of advance. And therefore if I am asked what the Christian Churches should now do, my answer, in a single word, would be "Repent".

The very fact that as an immature Christian I can offer this advice to the organized Churches is strong grounds for supposing that my own attitude contains too much pride and too little repentance. If I now suggest the lines along which I believe the Churches must repent, I hope that any individual Christian will feel assured that I shall be grateful and not hostile if he does the same to me.

Putting it briefly, it is the duty of the Churches to lead people to believe in God and to behave like Christians. Granting that it may be in practice impossible to separate these two tasks, I would like for one moment, and for the purposes of argument, to suppose that they could be separated. Which of the two would then be the more important—to God? Surely the second. It is surely more important to God that people should behave like Christians than that they should be in that state of mind which they themselves would call "believing in God".

If this is so, and if there were any truth in the medieval view of the after life, then I fear that many Bishops in discomfort would see Communist agitators received into St. Peter's arms.

And someone would say to the Communists: "You saw me blistered with Italian mustard gas, and although you may not have done it very intelligently, you tried to help me. You saw me thrown on the human scrap-heap, unemployed and unwanted, and you gave your time to difficult books to try to understand why this had happened to me, and some of you, in comfortable jobs, risked your own future to try to proclaim what you found".

And someone would say to the Bishops: "You saw me blistered with Italian mustard gas, and you did not do a thing for

fear of offending the Conservative Party head office. You saw me thrown on to the human scrap-heap, and you said, 'Christianity is not concerned with economics' ".

When, more usually, the Church calls the people to repentance, what is the Church's complaint? A godless people, drunk with the quest for material wealth, degraded by the pursuit of vapid sensations at cinema and dog track, doped by a yellow press, devoid of any sense of ultimate values, rotted with the vice of humanism.

A true indictment of most of us. But whence do all these evils spring? They spring from a single source. From end to end of the Gospels it is proclaimed that material wealth cannot be the goal of human life. We have deliberately built up our whole society on the assumption that material wealth is indeed the goal of human life. The Old Testament and the New tell us categorically, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself". We have built up our whole society on the one basic law, "Thou shalt promote thine own self-interest".

And against this open paganism the Churches, for at least a hundred and fifty years, remained silent.

Richard Cobden once said, "We preach nothing contrary to the law of the Lord Jesus Christ when we say that man shall buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest". Against this the Churches did not protest. Nor does it help to quote passages from Charles Kingsley or Bishop Gore. The existence of these exceptions makes the general silence the more serious. For the fact remains that in spite of the courageous warnings of a few Christians, the Churches as a whole allowed humanity to develop along the lines of nineteenth century individualism without doing anything which effectively forced men to understand that they were heading for disaster.

Nor is it the least use now to attack humanism as if it were itself the originating cause of national godlessness. In face of the betrayal of their duty by the Churches—for it was a betrayal—humanism (*i.e.*, the quest of good for no other purpose and with no other guidance than the service of humanity) was the highest form of human expression which organized Christianity left open to mankind. And, moreover, many of those who have, perhaps, advanced furthest under humanism are beginning to learn for themselves, rather than from the teaching of any Church, their own incompleteness, and their need for an inspiration transcending anything which can be found either in humanity or in individual man.

It is therefore, in my view, essential that the Christian Churches shall so fully repent as to be enabled to make contact

with the best in humanism, and thereby lead our people from their present self-centred lives towards a more Christian way of living and towards the Christian faith.

For this purpose it will not be sufficient for the Churches to say now what they should have said a hundred years ago. It will not be sufficient merely to pass minatory judgments on the possible dangers of the profit motive if insufficiently controlled. It is significant that the Christian Churches are discovering the dangers of the profit motive at exactly the same time as the Federation of British Industries is discovering the impossibility of competition. The F.B.I. recommends, for the future, disciplined industries—self-disciplined by the industrialists—with the right to use the power of the State to put down any unruly company which might break the rules in the mere quest of its own individual profit!

Indeed, among the smaller problems, none is more important for the Churches than the clearing up of the confusion about the words "profit motive". In its widest sense "profit" can be said to be earned when any man gets any extra money for doing any extra work or any better work. In this sense the profit motive is involved in all such arrangements as piece-rates, group bonuses, and higher pay for more skilled or more responsible work. At some future date we may or may not be able to dispense with the profit motive in this sense. The Russians have found they cannot dispense with it in Russia, and I know of no one who is suggesting that we should dispense with it here, or that its continuance makes the next stage in the advance towards Christianity impossible for us.

In the narrower sense, "profit" is earned when, by virtue of his or their private ownership, an owner or group of owners are in a position to receive the difference between the costs of production and the sale price of the goods or services produced by any productive unit. This "profit" is received, of course, not in relation to any work done, but merely in relation to ownership. And this ownership confers upon the owners the right to *some* measure of control over the policy of the productive unit concerned; and in deciding between one policy and another they are influenced, wholly or in part, by their estimate of the effect of the alternative policies upon the size of the profit.

No one to my knowledge suggests that none of us can behave as a Christian so long as any of us are influenced by the "profit motive" in its widest sense. But some of us do say that it remains permanently impossible for the generality of men to behave more nearly like Christians while the structure of our economic life is such that most of it functions under the influence of the "profit motive" in its narrowest sense.

We are not condemning—or at any rate we are not suggesting that we can as yet dispense with—the *motive* in the heart of man. We are condemning the economic structure. In fact, we condemn not the quest of private advantage (which, when secondary, is wholly consistent with Christianity), but the private ownership of the great productive resources of the community, which we believe denies to mankind the possibility of putting self-interest second to service.

Finally it must be observed that we do not make an unqualified judgment against private ownership of all forms of property, at all times, and in all forms of society. We do not condemn, indeed we welcome, the private ownership of all personal property such as furniture, houses, and bicycles. We can conceive of a peasant community served by purely rural industries in units so small that one man would seldom employ as many as ten others; and in such a community we can see the possibility of Christianity and private ownership flourishing side by side. It is, indeed, because of this that most of us suppose that the private ownership of the quite small productive units will be preserved in our own country. Our judgment relates solely to what we believe to be the quite inevitable physical shape of the main productive resources in our own country for the next hundred years. And we say, with some emphasis, that the continued existence of Christianity and the private ownership of these resources is mutually inconsistent.

After all we have to appeal to the individual man—that is to say in most cases the individual weekly wage earner. We have to appeal to him to think of his daily working life in terms of service to his fellow-men before he thinks of it in terms of his own interests. This must in any case be a formidable undertaking. But, in a proper environment, I cannot believe that it is impossible. I like to think of someone, perhaps a shop steward or a minister of religion or a representative of the Ministry of Information, addressing a meeting of, shall I say, bricklayers. And I like to think of him first of all explaining, in very matter of fact terms, the details of a group bonus scheme, a target of so many houses to be built in so many months, and so much extra to be shared by all in the event of the target being exceeded; then next explaining the agreed piece-rates, so that each man may feel he will have a little more if he does his best; but then I would like to think of him changing his key, swinging into his most stirring language, and even in all reverence invoking the name of God, in order to appeal for work as service and as worship. I want him to be able to say, "These details which I have been explaining to you are of a wholly secondary importance. They have been arranged in order to give you a fair break. But the real point is that our people need

houses, and it is our task to build them. Therefore, friends and comrades, let us roll up our sleeves, bend our backs, use our whole ingenuity, and get down to the job and deliver good measure pressed down and shaken together".

I believe that this sort of appeal can win a response from ninety in every hundred; I believe nine of the remaining ten, who might not wish to respond, will be led forward by the fear of social ostracism which pursues all slackers where general morale is good; and I believe the hundredth is a subject for psychiatric treatment. But I am convinced that this appeal cannot even be made—no shop steward would be found willing to undertake it in peace time—if he knew that he must meet the questioner from the back who would ask, "All very well to talk like that, but if we work that way, just how much does it mean to Sir So-and-so Such-and-such and the other big shareholders in this firm?"

There is no answer to this question. At any rate I have asked many Christians to suggest the answer which they would give, and none has responded. Unless this question *is* answered, in all humility I must insist that we are right when we say that so long as the shape of our society is such that the men at the top are, or appear to be, handling their problems in terms of "What does it mean to me?", so long also must all other men think of their own daily lives first and foremost in the same terms. In other words, it is the private ownership of the main productive resources of the country which prevents our advance towards a more nearly Christian way of life. If this is so, the particular act which is now required of the Christian Churches, as a mark of their repentance, is that a sufficient number of Christians, both lay and ordained, shall now say, "In the name of God, private ownership must be brought to an end".

They must say this, in my view, because it is true. They must also say it because it enables them to make contact with all that is growing up most vigorously and healthily outside their borders. After all, the Christian condemnation of our present population is not wholly true. There were some who were not wholly infected by our decline into a worthless way of life;; there were some who protested. Not only Communists struggled against the immorality of our foreign policy. Many detested the yellow press; some went to concerts more often than to cinemas and dog tracks. Most of these spiritually rejected the whole conception of a community directed towards material gain. Most of them are now Socialists[1].

It is the fact, too, that almost all the alert forward-looking socially-conscious workers today are Socialists. Often they are Socialists for all sorts of reasons which the organized Churches

[1] It may be a part of my own repentance to have to admit that until the outbreak of war I myself was not.

could not approve. It is sometimes suggested that all weekly wage earners are saints, that all owners are devils, and that all we have to do is to take everything from the owners and give it to the workers and all will come right. Against this the Churches must protest. Against this the Churches must insist that no scheme of political change can save us unless we as individuals live our lives more generously towards our fellow men. To all this thousands are willing to listen today.

It is certainly a little harder to lead men to an acceptance of the fact that the generous life towards one's fellow-man depends ultimately on faith in God and upon a life directed to His service. But when this truth is advanced by one who incidentally passes stern and unambiguous judgment on the present shape of society, men will at least listen.

On the other hand, if it is true that in our present society the private ownership of the great resources permanently prevents us from living more nearly Christian lives, then men will not even listen to organized Churches which have not the courage to say so in the name of the Lord.

The Bishop of Bradford is right, I believe, in his introduction to the first publication of the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership[2]. "Our present economic system", he says,

> is immoral and un-Christian. Its appeal is nakedly to self-interest . . . it promotes mass selfishness . . . nothing can excuse a minister of Christ from working for its destruction. . . . The private ownership of the means of production is the nerve-centre of the system. To attack it is to attack the particular point at which the immorality of the system is most manifest and most corrosive.

I believe it is from those who will join the Bishop in this courageous message that our people will once more hear the Word of God.

[2] Because I was asked what the Christian Churches should do now, I may perhaps be allowed to add that the address of the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership (or C.C.M.C.O.) is 28 Maypole Lane, Birmingham, 14.

Mr. Erich Meissner's *Germany in Peril* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) is a book which makes one furiously to think. Aided by life and literature he elaborates his argument that Germany is deteriorating rapidly, the main causes being "Hitler's suburban movement, Prussia, and the Philosophy of Nihilism, Industrialism with its instability and intrinsic weakness providing the setting". These three forces are destructive, they dissolve traditions, they uproot, and now they are combined together. Can Germany be saved? Only if Hitler can be defeated, *and* the triumph of Prussia in 1866 and 1871 undone. Mr. Meissner does not dare to answer his question. In some parts his outlook is very similar to that of Mr. H. J. Massingham in the book reviewed elsewhere. We have 1922 for 1932 on p. 85.

UNITY AND FREEDOM

By the Rev. J. M. Phillips, B.A.

To all who have the spirit of Christ there is, of course, one Lord, one faith and one baptism. The faith is in God who has spoken and acted in Jesus Christ to the end that all men might be saved unto eternal life. The Church is the instrument of that blessed purpose. The baptism is into His spirit who was sent to be the propitiation of our sins. But God, who made men of many races and colours—and made us indeed of two sexes—must love variety within the unity of His purpose.

"Be sure you study the great diversity of human nature", said Kant. So when devoted people long for unity it seems to me they long for what we already have who are catholic Christians rather than exclusive churchmen; but some of them appear to desire a unity of organization that is not desirable even if it were obtainable. Indeed the observation of the diversity of human nature has long led me to believe that if we could increasingly emphasize our essential spiritual unity with all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth and sufficiently strip ourselves of all ambitions except for the glory of God and the service of our fellow men, the quickest as well as the best way to unity would be to encourage Christian people to make their home in that part of the visible Church in which they felt best able to serve God. There are some Free Churchmen who ought to be Anglicans; there are some Anglicans who would be far more enthusiastic Christians as Free Churchmen. For what is Apollos and what is Paul, if Christ be all in all? As the Churches become less worldly, their unity will become more manifest. But until churchmanship and hierarchical ecclesiasticism are recognized to be the very different things they are, reunion will tarry, and I think ought to tarry. I do not understand a Prince of the Church—of Christ. I think the term Lord-spiritual is a contradiction in terms except when it is applied, with a very different meaning from the usual, to the only Lord Spiritual of us all.

I am not handling grave matters lightly. Consider the significance of our freedom against the background of modern movements and developments. Observe how easily the authoritarian spirit and philosophy have become totalitarian over great parts of the world. Consider the spread of imposed discipline over so much of our own lives—and then ask yourselves whether the pattern of life that is emerging is to be discerned in the mind of Christ. Consider, too, how much the Christian Church and the Kingdom of

God in the world have owed to the voluntary spirit, and how much this beloved country of ours and the British Empire have owed to that spirit—to the vision and the labours of dedicated souls demanding freedom to pursue the Holy Grail across oceans and continents. And though wars can no longer be won by voluntary armies, yet even within the conscript armies the volunteer is always needed for the most critical and dangerous work. But life is not all war. Think of hospitals, schools, universities, social reform movements, these churches of ours, our missionary societies. Do they not mightily enrich our life? Have they not already played a mighty part in the redemption of the world? Whence came they? They were born, like all living things, one by one. Is there to be no more place for the spirit that perceives the needs and devises the means to meet them? It is that spirit that made our history. And, whatever may be our future, we need never be ashamed of our past. Our forefathers saved religion in England in the seventeenth century and laid the foundations of modern democracy in England and America.

Planning, organization and the sanctions of force have their great usefulness in human affairs, but deep in the spirit of the best men and women in every generation is the need for freedom to follow a star, to meet a need, to listen to the word of God, to respond to His call. The State can only follow. It is the soul that is the pioneer. Time was when men believed themselves to be upon an expedition of eternal significance. Such a time will come again, and with it a religion worthy of it.

So I believe that in these revolutionary years it is most gravely important that the sacred dignity of the soul of man alone before God, responsible to Him in all things done and left undone, should be preserved, maintained and extended. That means we shall minister to one another, giving in our receiving and receiving in our giving, but what priest or Führer is it that dares to stand between a man summoned to an eternal destiny and His heavenly Father, or dares to dispense, as though he had the power to withhold it, the saving grace of our blessed Lord? When the Prodigal came home there was no gatekeeper to let him in or shut him out.

Our Congregational witness was never more difficult to maintain than amid the storms of these tempestuous years; but I am deeply convinced that that witness, if we were only great enough and good enough to make it effective, was never more necessary. The ideal of the contented robot I do not find in the New Testament. Even to the *happy* slave Christ comes to break the shackles he has learnt to love. For Christ *is* freedom—freedom not to please ourselves, but to do the will of God. Better that a man should be wrong for the right reasons—as our fathers often were—than right for the

wrong reasons, as are so many of our present revolutionaries. That indeed is our answer to Hitler's New Order, for that is the difference between the woman who was a sinner and the Pharisee who condemned her.

It is important to remember that we do not merely claim freedom as a privilege or even as a right. If that were all we could surrender it at discretion. Our freedom we take from Christ Himself as a responsibility we may not evade. In Berdyaev's words[1]:

> The lure of the devil is not freedom, as has often been thought, but the rejection of freedom for the sake of ease and comfort mechanically forced upon men.

That is why the sin of the German people is so great. Their sin is the sin of surrendering to Hitler what ought to be surrendered only to God. And so many of them, good, simple people, who only wanted security and safety, sold themselves to the Devil and have become, no doubt to their own astonishment, the tools of criminals and the very agents through whom have been done deeds of such horror as will haunt them and the whole of Europe for generations. It all began very simply by men selling their freedom for security.

Yet man left to himself, free to pursue his own devices, may fail, indeed always does fail. What then can we do with liberty which we must not surrender and cannot worthily use?

The Christian paradox is that man's freedom justifies itself only when it is offered to God. To none other may it surrender. To Him it must. Man—that is, you and I, ministers, deacons, Church members—must learn obedience like our Lord Himself, of whom it is said that "though he were a son yet learned he obedience through the things which he suffered".

Now that is language which we understand. Those familiar words are heavy with meaning today. In order to be able to bear the burden of the world's sin even Christians must learn obedience as Christ learnt obedience in order to become the world's Saviour. In order to help, then, is it not enough to be *willing* to help? By no means. To be able to help, we must be fit to help. And the need is so great. The sins of the world are so heavy. Who is not conscious of the weight and the horror of them?

Forty years ago Sir Oliver Lodge said that modern man was not worrying about his sins. He was not. But we are worrying about the consequences of his not worrying. We are worrying over the careless, arrogant optimism of men who were conscious of the mighty powers and limitless promise of science and confident about the future in which mankind, in the words of a later Prime Minister, was to go on and on and on, and up and up and up. About the same time as Sir Oliver Lodge spoke, William

[1] *The Destiny of Man*, 362.

James, the American philosopher, could say that a civilized man could live through the whole of his life and never experience for a single instant the emotion of fear. And there was the small boy who, in a school essay on cats, wrote that "a cat has nine lives but he does not need them all now because of Christianity".

The doctrine of evolution, "that mask of ignorance", had displaced the doctrine of God's grace and was interpreted to justify an exhaustless optimism that was reinforced by the application of scientific discovery to manufacture and agriculture. God's command to have dominion and subdue the earth came to mean the irresponsible exploitation of all natural resources, and that passed easily enough into the equally irresponsible exploitation of the poor of all races and nations including our own. The accidental and temporary elements in our prosperity were ignored. Privilege rather than responsibility seemed to be the gift of God. The Church of Christ developed a social Gospel that forgot with the rest of the world the dark abysses of the human heart and the dreadful possibilities that always lie in the abuse of power. The Gospel that comforts the weak had lost its power to challenge the strong. And today we stand amid the ruins of it all. The era of exclusive prosperity has gone. The dominance of the rich man in the community, the dominance of the mercantile interests within the State, and the dominance of the money-lending countries in the fraternity of nations—these have perished in these revolutionary years. And if we are to live in peace and yet satisfy the heart's desire of our youth for adventure and service, we must recover the values that have been destroyed by the power of money and hear again the word of God that speaks of His love for the common man who makes and grows and is meant to consume and enjoy.

What we have done is to depress the creator and exalt the trader, to impoverish the producer and enrich the merchant—until production produced poverty and the benefactor was he who curtailed and destroyed.

Let us remind ourselves, bitter though the recollection be, that it was but yesterday, *i.e.*, as late as 1935, 1936 and 1937, that we were being instructed by certain wise fools in the economics of scarcity, burning corn and coffee, ploughing back into the soil cabbages and cotton, closing down pits and raking out blast furnaces; contemptuously flinging back in the face of God the too liberal gifts of His providence. Human needs and values were ignored until we produced a society which grew vastly richer in money values and rapidly poorer in human values, till whole communities were left to rot, and the raising of a normal family, instead of being a spiritual adventure, became one long financial embarrassment. Even now in the middle classes young married

people, educated largely at the public expense, can earn two incomes to support one home and shrink from having children because the birth of a child would at once increase their expenses and halve their income. We pay a married woman who goes out to work in a factory, office or school, while the mother who bears her children and works all day to nurture them receives, let us hope, her puny share of the miserably inadequate children's allowances on her husband's income tax.

The gravity of the present situation, possibly but not certainly, justifies the encouragement of mothers of children and potential mothers to seek gainful occupation. They then become "working women", to whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes tax concessions. Mothers of children who are too busy maintaining their homes and bringing up their children are officially only dependents upon their husbands, for whom the Chancellor has no concessions. Present policies are financing a catastrophic fall in the birth-rate[2].

Family allowances need the urgent attention of everyone who is concerned for the well-being of the Church, the Nation and the Empire[3]. For look where this blindness to fundamental human and spiritual values has led us. In this country, for every 100 young men and women who came of age in 1940, there will be 70 in 1960. The population of New Zealand is 1½ millions. It has rather more cultivatable land than Japan, whose population is more than 70 millions. The population of Australia is 6½ millions, of whom 3½ millions live in towns—and even this number is not being maintained.

We have been brought to the edge of dreadful ruin by sins of greed and irresponsibility which none will acknowledge and which are still ignored by those who act as though the whole life of God's children can be set out in a balance sheet.

> The signal fires of warning
> They blaze but none regard,
> And on through night to morning
> The world runs ruinward.

So wrote A. E. Housman.

But more searching than any modern poet is the parable of our Lord of a fig tree that grew large and luxuriant. It laid appropriating hands on all the richness of the earth and all the ministries of the changing seasons. It was fed and watered by God's Almighty hand. The skill and husbandry of the vine dresser was not withheld from it. It was in no wise stricken or diseased. It enjoyed life. It had a good time. But it bore no fruit. So it was condemned. It was condemned by the order of the Universe of which

[2] This was written before the Beveridge Report.
[3] A Parliamentary White Paper has recently been issued on the subject.

it was part, because it received and did not transmit. For all its magnificence, it was a *cul-de-sac* of life. So it perished. Its uselessness came to an end. In our Lord's tremendous phrase, this luxuriant and quite harmless tree "cumbered the ground".

I quoted Sir Oliver Lodge's frank—and even complacent—assertion that his contemporaries were not worrying about their sins, and I said that we are worrying about the consequences of their indifference. But are we worrying about *our* sins? I see no sign of it. I do not mean we are not sorry for ourselves. I do not even mean that we are not now lamenting that arrogant complacency of thought and policy which is summed up in the word Munich, when we thought we had bought peace at someone else's expense and preened our feathers before the world as peace-makers. We know now that the wrong men were in power for the wrong reasons, working with wrong motives for wrong ends. But, as Dr. Temple has reminded us, our deepest sins are those of which we are unaware. The sign of repentance is not that we are sorry for things we know we have done or know we have left undone. The sign of repentance is that now at long last we are seeking to know the will of God and the power to do it. Our sin is that we ask God to do what we want. Religion becomes something that helps. Did religion help Jesus Christ? Yes, it helped Him to endure Gethsemane and go to the Cross . . . and *then*—so mysterious are the ways of God—to become the Saviour of the World. Did religion help St. Paul? Yes, to demand no privilege but service and to know how to abound and how to be abased.

We in our churches do not much abound in these days. Well, let us learn how to be abased—and who knows but our very abasement, like Paul's imprisonment, may turn out unto the furtherance of the Gospel.

Let me here say one word about our ministry. We have come to be very greatly dependent upon our ministers. Many churches are very nearly one man businesses. I wish it were not so. But if it is, the responsibility for the time being must be accepted and used. The ministry is a vocation. It has its professional aspects, but when the ministry of the word of God becomes a badly paid profession with a few prizes for the most gifted, how does our righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees? Who are we to teach if we have not ourselves learnt that to seek the Kingdom comes first to a Christian as to a soldier? So a minister must be personally disinterested, and for the sake of the weak ones of Christ's flock, it were better that he should be manifestly so. Thus only can he keep the integrity of his own soul. Our churches have the right to expect their ministers to be as free from personal ambition as a Spitfire pilot, as devoted to the cause as a leader of Commando troops—as surely as he is free from idleness, sloth, and

all the obvious sins of the unregenerate man in a competitive and acquisitive society. That is the eminence from which he speaks of God's sufficient grace. Of the immediate resuscitation of our beloved churches, I have, alas, but little to say. I cannot discern the pattern of the social and religious order of the future. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. But God reigns . . . let the earth rejoice.

There are winter days when, if a man have faith in the coming of spring, he will dig his garden over two spits deep—and let the storms and the winds and the frosts work their will. For even in these forces of destruction there is beneficence. And seed-time will come and the harvest be the greater because the frost and the snow have broken down the stubborn clay and the mysterious alchemy of the soil builds up again what will glorify God and gladden the heart of man. Let us then in this winter of our discontent dig, two spits deep, into our hearts. The stubborn clay of the privilege and prosperity of those who have long sat at ease in Zion will be beaten upon by these storms of our present afflictions, and when our pride is broken and we know ourselves for miserable sinners, the seed that is the word of God being sown in our hearts by the Holy Spirit will germinate again and cover the naked earth with living green. For whatever is hidden from us in this dreadful fog of war, this is certain: that we and this perishing world of which we are part need nothing so much as we need the ministry of the saving word of God.

For myself I do not doubt that the mighty moral and material powers that lie in our people and those who are associated with us will prevail against the powers of evil darkness that fell upon us to eat up our flesh. But when peace comes with its needs and opportunities those powers will need direction. Nay, more: they will need dedication. Only if we ourselves are dedicated as free men whose integrity and responsibility justify their freedom can we begin to leaven the community—the world—which, though it is fallen deeply into sin, God so loved that He sent His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

"As the Father hath sent me", said our Lord, "even so send I you".

The Bishop of Münster and the Nazis (Burns, Oates, 2s.) contains a translation by Mr. Patrick Smith of Bishop Galen's three anti-Gestapo sermons preached in July and August, 1941. These are amazingly outspoken; at times they almost use the same words as John Penry used before his death in 1593—and we can pay no higher tribute to the Bishop's courage.

SOME VERY MINOR PROPHETS

By Dr. W. B. Selbie, M.A.

There lies before me as I write a rather battered manuscript book with the letters "M.P." stamped on its cover. It is the minute book of a little society of Congregational ministers who modestly called themselves "Minor Prophets". The secret of the initials, however, was well kept and not even divulged to the wives and families of the members. Many interpretations were current, the most favoured being Mad Parsons and Mixed Pickles. The origin of the Society was on this wise. During the May Meetings of the year 1899 four men met by chance in a tea-room on Ludgate Hill. They were Silvester Horne, T. H. Darlow, W. H. Bennett, and the present writer. All of them were considerably disgruntled, or in the slang of today "fed up", with their experiences of organized Congregationalism. They felt that the proceedings of the Union were rather remote from the life and needs of the churches. They were tired of long platitudinous speeches and of resolutions which gave expression to admirable sentiments but left things just as they were. They seemed to themselves to represent a point of view that never found sympathy in official circles, and then, as so often both before and since, they were conscious of their mission as that of the younger generation knocking at the door and seeking to give articulate expression to its ideas and aims. They passed no formal resolutions, but they agreed among themselves then and there that they would try to get together in London a dozen or so of younger, forward-looking ministers that they might exchange ideas, clarify their minds by discussion, and be ready to act together and pull their weight whenever occasion offered. At Bennett's suggestion they agreed to call themselves "M.P.s" and talked over the names of some who might join them.

The canvassing of these took some time, but the Club or Society was at length duly constituted. Its original members, in addition to the four already mentioned, were P. T. Forsyth, R. Wardlaw Thompson, Wm. Pierce, W. F. Adeney, W. J. Dawson, J. D. McClure, A. N. Johnson, Bernard Snell, W. Hardy Harwood, and Joseph Halsey. Later additions were A. E. Garvie, R. J. Campbell, F. A. Russell, J. Lewis Paton, Thos. Yates, R. J. Wells, Baldwin Brindley, and G. Campbell Morgan. The constitution of the Society was the simplest possible. The members met at one another's houses, and the host for the time being was both Chairman and Secretary. It was his business to introduce a subject

for discussion, or to arrange for someone else to do so, to write up the minutes of the meeting, and to pass on the minute book to the member in whose home the next meeting was to be held. Occasional failure to do this is responsible for some unfortunate gaps in the series of minutes.

The M.P.s continued to meet and talk at irregular intervals during the years 1900 to 1911, when the Society seems to have died a natural death. To read the record of their meetings at this distance of time is to plunge into another and strange world and to recall many happy memories and associations. In those safe, self-indulgent, pre-war years we were mostly bemused by our belief in progress. Even when we were most critical of the *status quo* and of the many evils that confronted us, we still believed that there was a best yet to be and that we had only to open our eyes and put our shoulders to the wheel and we should find the Kingdom of Heaven just round the corner. We had a pathetic belief in the possibilities of reform, in the inherent goodness of human nature, and in the potency of men and women of goodwill if only they would get together. It is easy to see now that we were living on the brink of a volcano and wholly blind to the signs of the times. We had none of the vision and insight of true prophets, in spite of our name.

To the casual reader many of these minutes will seem very light-hearted, not to say frivolous. They seem to pay more attention to the jokes, stories, and good fun that characterized our meetings than to the serious topics of discussion. Some of our number followed the example of Mr. Silas Wegg and "dropped into poetry". Horne and Forsyth regularly, and others occasionally, wrote their minutes in the form of doggerel verse which is often clever enough but too full of personal allusions and casual incident to be quite intelligible today. I think that at times we all felt very much like Dr. Johnson's friend, who all his life tried to be a philosopher but failed because, as he said, "cheerfulness kept breaking through". So with us, even when we had themes of great import to discuss, cheerfulness kept breaking in, and I do not believe that our discussions were any the worse for it. We were all very busy men with many problems to face, and when we came together it was right and natural that we should help one another to face them in a spirit of joyous *camaraderie* rather than in an atmosphere of unrelieved seriousness and gloom. In this surely we set a good example. A sense of humour is one of the great gifts of God, and Christian people generally need to cultivate it more diligently than they do. They need not be blind to the tragedy in mortal things, or deaf to the "still sad music of humanity". They can never get away from the fact of the Cross or forget the sin that coucheth at the door. But as Christians they know that the

Cross points to a resurrection and sin to the forgiveness and grace of God. Their religion is a religion of redemption and therefore one that entitles them to rejoice in the Lord alway. If we may judge of the religion of these M.P.s by its expression in their conversation and concerns, it was of a thoroughly healthy and happy type.

Among the burning subjects discussed from time to time perhaps the most prominent was the state of the Congregational Churches—their worship, their ministry, and their representation in the Union of England and Wales. This was all apropos of Dr. Parker's proposal for a United Congregational Church. Other recurring topics were the condition and prospects of the London Missionary Society, the Education Question, the Liberation Society and Disestablishment, Evangelistic Missions (*e.g.*, Torrey and Alexander), the New Theology, Religion and Politics. It will be noted that many of these subjects are still being debated as live issues while others are practically dead. If it be asked what came of all this talk and is there anything definite to show for it, I can only answer that as far as my own recollection goes the meetings of the M.P.s did help to clarify one's ideas and to suggest certain lines of action. If they put a curb sometimes on the hot-headed impatience of some members they gingered up the timid conservatism of others. Thus they no doubt influenced the speech and actions of all concerned without committing them to any fixed policy or programme. How far that influence may have gone is indicated by the fact that in after days no fewer than nine of the M.P.s became Chairmen of the Congregational Union, and five of them heads of Congregational Colleges.

From the list of subjects discussed it would almost seem as though the M.P.s were more interested in the practical side of Christianity and Church life than in theology. But this was by no means the case. If cheerfulness was apt to break in on all occasions, so was theology, for practically every subject that came up had its theological implications. Quite the most important service rendered by the Club was in enabling men of very diverse theological opinions to meet together on a footing of easy comradeship to discuss their differences and learn to understand and respect one another. When one thinks of the very varied and even antagonistic standpoints represented by men like Garvie and Forsyth on the one hand, and Snell, Halsey, and Campbell on the other, it is obvious that the M.P.s harboured a good deal of explosive material. But no explosion ever took place. We learnt how to agree to differ. Every one was perfectly free to express his own views and to criticize those of his neighbour. But no one tried to make proselytes, and all alike felt that their own position was clarified, and even modified, by this process of rubbing shoulders

and exchanging ideas. Certainly there is a great deal more to be said for this way of conducting theological controversy than for that which obtains at the present time. In the M.P.s we had right-wing Liberals, left-wing Modernists, and Evangelicals, and they all met and talked on the footing of their common Christianity. Today the men who represent these positions are herded into separate camps, little caves of Adullam from which they shout and shoot at one another from a distance so that "never the twain shall meet". It cannot be denied that forty or fifty years ago there were as acute differences between Liberals and Evangelicals as there are today, but there was more charity, more understanding, and a greater readiness to give and take. The liberal spirit is not the same thing as the liberal theology, and it is unfortunate that the eclipse of the one should have carried with it the decline of the other. The liberal spirit must be preserved at all costs, for it issues in the right kind of tolerance—a tolerance based not on indifference but on the charity that hopeth all things. It was this kind of tolerance that the method of the M.P.s so amply vindicated, and is so greatly endangered by the modern method of segregation into hostile camps.

Another consideration which made for unity amid diversity was a common concern to preach the gospel. These men were mostly preachers and conscious that they had a message. Their problem was how to get it across, first to the men and women of their own generation in the churches, who were a stiff-necked, self-satisfied, and gospel-hardened crowd, and next to the wholly indifferent multitude outside. They were in search of a theology that could be preached, and if they strayed from the path of orthodoxy, it was not due to any superfluity of naughtiness but to an earnest desire to vindicate the truth as they saw it and to bring it home to others in such terms as commended it to themselves. We have the same problem to face today. The secret of Christian unity, as of any successful evangelism, is a passionate belief in our gospel, in a word of God which is like a fire in our bones and constrains us to cry, Woe is me if I preach it not.

We have already referred to the good fellowship among the M.P.s, but it deserves more than a passing mention. Ministers are often very lonely men. They may have a host of devoted supporters in their churches, but it is seldom wise to make intimate friends of any of them. They know what it is to be lonely in a crowd. So too in more formal meetings of ministers—Councils, Committees, and even Fraternals—it is curious how little real friendship or frank intimacy obtains. Conditions are such that men find it hard to be really natural, to say what they think, and to avoid petty rivalries and jealousies. But among the M.P.s it was very different. The great attraction of their meetings was the

entire absence of constraint and their frank and open friendliness. We came to them with a sense of release and they served as brief interludes of holiday in our busy lives. And they also taught us the meaning and worth of "sharing" long before "groups" were heard of. Now and again a member would bring up some problem or difficulty of a private and personal kind on which he sought the counsel and sympathy of his brethren. Such sharing of concern among a band of brothers is legitimate and healthy, and quite a different thing from that which the name often denotes.

It has been said that looking backward is always an encouragement to look forward, and the reading of this old minute book constrains one to thank God for the past and take courage for the future. But this does not mean indiscriminate laudation of the past. We owe much to the men who lived and taught in it and served their generation well, and we may well thank God on every remembrance of them. But we have to live in the present and to prepare for the future. As Christians we are confronting today a situation such as none of us in those early years of the century could have dreamed of. Two wars, and the rise of the Fascist and Nazi philosophies, have given us something to think about and rudely disturbed our complacency. We used to complain sometimes that our Churches were too comfortable. The disabilities from which they once suffered had mostly been removed, and they were inclined to settle down on their lees. We even suggested that a little persecution and suffering might be good for them. Well, they have got it now with a vengeance, and not the Free Churches alone. All over Europe Christianity is challenged and fighting for its life. In this country, too, where we have only suffered the loss of buildings and precious lives, it is obvious that the Christian way of life is on its trial. Many are loudly protesting that the new order must be based on Christian principles, but no one seems to know quite what that means or how it is to be brought about. Reflection on the past would at least suggest the need for a real rather than a sectarian Christianity and for the ruthless application of the Christian ethic in every department of life. We were discussing these things forty years ago. What we need now is not discussion but action.

Enough has been said, I hope, to rescue from oblivion the work of these very minor prophets. Their minute book will find a last resting-place in the Mansfield College Library, where it can be inspected by the curious. Fifty years hence it will be a much bigger curiosity than it is today.

THE DRIFT TO CANTERBURY

By Dr. E. L. Allen.

A few years ago one of my best friends, a Presbyterian minister, resigned his charge and "went over", as we say in these cases, to the Church of England. The news came as no surprise; those who knew him had been expecting just such a step. Shortly after, a Baptist minister who, as pastor of a Union Church, had been uncompromising in his adherence to the principle of believers' immersion, re-appeared as an Anglican curate. Shortly after again, a Methodist minister remarked in the course of conversation that the position in his family was a singular one, since all his sons and daughters were confirmed members of the Church of England: within six months he had followed them. Congregationalists could relate many similar incidents from the time of the Rev. R. J. Campbell to today. Ex-Free-Churchmen are everywhere in the Church of England; they live in bishops' palaces, hold canons' stalls, and lecture from professorial chairs. Granted that the Church of England has gained by this, we of the Free Churches have certainly lost heavily. On all these accounts, is it not time that we faced seriously this disconcerting fact of the drift towards Canterbury?

Our concern is not diminished by the fact that we no longer regard those who have left us in this way as "lost souls". Some of them, it is true, rush to Anglo-Catholic extremes, but others retain a genuine interest in and sympathy with the communion they have left, counting it an honour to serve as bridge-builders. In either case, we are content to say that they have found a more congenial sphere of service: but the question why it is more congenial has still to be answered. Nor are our regrets wholly dissipated by the reflection that we are less certain than we used to be of the value of our denominational distinctions and that a United Church is today our goal. Have we so long resisted union by absorption only to have it come about by a series of individual desertions? Just as a true internationalism is impossible without an appreciation of the several national cultures, so the units which are to enter into the united Christendom of the future must be self-respecting and characterized in each case by a sense of the value of their own tradition. Is this essential condition likely to be fulfilled when so many even of our ministers seem, after years of service, doubtful of the cause they have hitherto served?

Let us consider some of the reasons which drive men to accept a change of allegiance even at the price of re-ordination.

In the first place, economic considerations must be allowed considerable weight. The voluntary system which was the pride of our fathers has become a burden to their children, and many men seek release from a type of ministry which seems at every point to be cumbered by the necessity for raising funds. Endowments under these circumstances are suggestive of independence and of liberation from the unwelcome task of serving tables. The voluntary system seems to require one of two conditions if it is to function successfully: there must either be a surplus of wealth in the hands of our members or a sacrificial passion on their part for the maintenance of the Church. Time was, in the last century, when the Free Churches had both: today we have fewer of those princely givers whom we once numbered among us, and our people no longer regard the Church as the first claim on their income. It is not merely that the cinema and the theatre now open their purses; the income-tax authorities drain them too. Is it to be wondered at that men lose heart in the struggle to make ends meet, and seek relief where congregations are not dependent for their existence on a round of special efforts?

In the second place, an æsthetic appreciation has developed among our people which our services often do not satisfy. As one whose work is largely among Anglican theological students and who is struck by the fact that so many of these come from Free Church homes and even from Free Church manses, I can bear witness to the attraction which the Anglican Church exercises by her liturgy and her use of music in public worship, as well as by the stately beauty of so many of her buildings. It may well be that there is something here which we cannot hope to remedy; it may well be that our tradition, our sense that Protestantism is, in Karl Heim's phrase, "the religion of conscience", will not allow us to vie with the Anglican Church in this respect. For us the preaching of the Word must always be central, and while we may rightly learn to incorporate into our churches and our worship a larger measure of what is æsthetically satisfying, there will always be something of a gulf between Protestant and Catholic types in this respect.

A third consideration is the attraction of a national Church as against a Nonconformist denomination. A German refugee pastor, speaking of some of his colleagues who proposed to settle in this country, remarked that the choice for such men was between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland: they could not enter anything suggestive of sectarianism. The desire for a Church which will accept responsibility for the welfare of the nation as such, and not merely for the private lives of individuals within it, is one of the main forces which lead men to accept re-ordination:

it seems a small price to pay for such an enlargement of opportunity. Now that it is possible to be a bishop and an advocate of disestablishment at one and the same time, the connection between Church and State has become such that the former is no longer bound to the interests of the latter, but can in fact serve as its spiritual guide. The Free Churches, with the decay of the Liberal party, have no longer the political weapon which they once possessed; the Church of England speaks with a decided voice, while the Nonconformist conscience can only say the "Amen".

Many of our people are exercised by the self-evident fact that the moral leadership of the community is with the bench of bishops and no longer where it was in the days of Silvester Horne and John Clifford. The State Church has actually a larger measure of spiritual independence than the Free Churches; one wonders, for example, whether either the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of Birmingham would have risen to eminence in one of our denominations. Behind this seems to lie the fact that the political landscape has changed its character since the beginning of the century: economic questions are today much more prominent than they were only a generation ago. The rise of the Labour Party has forced us to face new issues, so that even in conservative Britain the possibility of social unrest on a mass-scale cannot be entirely discounted. Under these circumstances, the churches which are based on the voluntary system are more uneasy than the endowed ones, for they are to a larger extent in the hands of the owners of private wealth. Half a century ago men were still seeking to restrict the powers of the State; today the industrial system is the enemy, and the powers of the State are bound to be very considerably augmented in the future. The churches of private and group enterprise seem to many to be by their very nature incapacitated for dealing with our present problems.

I am not here concerned to ask how far these criticisms are justified: they are present in many minds, and full justice must be done to them. But they are probably to be regarded less as causes for the secessions which we regret than as symptoms of a malady which is much more deep-seated. They raise the question of the rationale of the Free Churches.

What we most lack is a common conviction in the religious and therefore also in the theological realm. These are days of ideologies —and we have none! It may be replied that the Established Church is in an equally precarious position, for has she not rabid Anglo-Catholic and fervent Evangelical within her borders, not to mention the Modernist, critic of them both? Where is her common conviction? The answer is twofold.

In the first place, there is something in Anglicanism which

unites even those who differ so much, a certain temper and attitude which is specifically English and cannot be understood by the Continental Protestant. In the second place, the Church of England can afford a greater measure of diversity, because she is so much more compact and organized than we are. Her unity is in the bench of bishops and the Book of Common Prayer; where is ours?

The great days of the Free Churches were those in which a common conviction gave them a *raison d'être* over against the State Church, however divided and mutually jealous they were among themselves. Time was, for example, when to be a Free Churchman was to be a Calvinist: we had a system of doctrine to oppose to the liturgical frivolities, as we thought them, of the Anglican communion: a generation brought up on the *Pilgrim's Progress* was in no doubt where it stood and it had a specific contribution to make to the national life. The Methodist Revival took from us what was left of this theological unity after the Rationalism of the eighteenth century had done its work, but it substituted Evangelicalism for it as the spiritual possession of our churches: we were one in the offer of the gospel of the grace of God to sinning men and women, one in Wesley's "Jesu, Lover of my soul" and Toplady's "Rock of Ages". In either case, to be a Free Churchman meant almost always to be a Christian of a certain definite and unmistakable type. Does it mean that now?

There are those who hope, to be sure, that the neo-Calvinism of the Continent will give us back what we have lost. But that is doubtful. For one thing, the Barthian and the anti-Liberal among us seem at least as tempted as anyone else to go over to Anglicanism; then, too, the younger theologians in the Church of England are displaying remarkable dialectical skill in enlisting Barth in the Anglo-Catholic cause as they once enlisted Otto. But our problem is too personal and national in its character to be solved by any mere importation: we must rediscover the truth of God as it impinges on our own situation. A Dutch contributor to the discussions which led up to the Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State remarked that the countries which were theologically least sound were somehow those in which the Christian message still had a real hold over the hearts of the people and a real power to shape the national life; he instanced Britain among these. Does not that suggest that his definition of what is "theologically sound" needed to be revised somewhat?

What we need in our Free Churches is a burning religious conviction held in common and a theology growing out of this; but both alike must be rooted in our tradition and our present necessities if they are to be of value in the long run.

It would be possible to go on at this point and say just what in

my opinion is the conviction which we need. I refrain from that course, however, since my purpose is rather to stimulate thought and to provoke to the search for such a unity. It will not come by any one person's suggestion nor by the findings of a committee, though both these may help it to come: in the last resort it must spring out of a common hunger for deeper satisfactions, a common penitence for the sin of merely continuing in existence without having an adequate reason for doing so, and a common dependence on God for His decisive revelation.

The main value of the Rev. Cecil Northcott's *Change Here for Britain* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) lies in the criticisms at the end, which make an admirable starting-point for group discussion. In his travels Mr. Northcott has taken notes of "the revolution that is happening", and on them he bases his survey of the problems confronting the Church and the world today and tomorrow. He is often dogmatic when we look for evidence or argument, and vague when we want him to be clear; but his critics have seized on these points, which makes the booklet all the more useful for its purpose.

It is not clear whether Mr. C. K. F. Brown's *The Church's Part in Education* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) secured the Oxford B.Litt. for which it was first designed or not. In that it fails to keep the promise of its title, it proved very disappointing, despite the useful material it incorporates. It is written "With Special Reference to the Work of the National Society", and a full account of that work would have been welcome in these days. But—omitting the good chapter on Secondary Education—the 20th century receives only four or five pages, and the Statistical Appendix gives the figures only to about 1900, and omits them when the number of voluntary schools begins to decrease. And surely a million has dropped off the average attendance at Board Schools and the totals in the years 1889 and 1890 (p. 172). Mr. Brown's bias is clear, and it is a pity, when Christians are getting together in regard to religious education, that he has not been content to prepare an objective record. Nonconformists have not always given Anglicans the credit due to them for the sacrifices they have made for their schools, and Mr. Brown had facts that could speak for themselves. The History of the National Society remains to be written; its author will find help, especially for the years to 1870, in the data Mr. Brown has collected.

It is noteworthy how unfamiliar young Members of Parliament—and young ministers of religion—are with the outlines of the Education controversy of 1902. In *Religious Education in England and Wales: Notes on its Past History and Present Position* (Christian Education Movement, 6d.) Canon Spencer Leeson and the Rev. F. Chalmers Rogers have provided a most useful guide for current discussions of the same problem.

Philippe Vernier has long been known to pacifists in this country as a young French Protestant minister who suffered a long period of imprisonment for refusing military service. *With the Master* (Lutterworth Press, 3s. 6d.) is the translation of a volume of short meditations on Scripture texts.

NEC PARES NEC SIMILES

By E. E. Kellett, M.A.

We are almost too familiar with comparisons between the Napoleonic war and the one which we are waging now; the vicissitudes, the hopes, the fears, the constant defections of our allies, the apparent invincibility of our enemies—these all remind us of the former times. When Hitler first makes a friend of Russia and then attacks her, we remember how Napoleon did precisely the same, and we recall how he said that he invaded Russia only because Moscow was on the main road to London. The likeness is also detected in side-issues; we may see Mr. Churchill, somewhat ambiguously, paralleled to Pitt, who, after an unbroken succession of disasters, constantly appeared in Parliament, "drew up his haughty head, and poured forth the lofty language of inextinguishable hope and inflexible resolution"; while the abuse with which Mr. Churchill is bespattered in Germany might be simply a translation of that to which Pitt was subjected in France. Nay, the fact that we were finally victorious in 1815 is undoubtedly at the root of our confidence that we shall one day finally triumph.

All this is more than plausible; but, when the parallel is carried still further, and an *essential* likeness is detected between the Führer of 1933 and the Emperor of 1804, it is necessary to distinguish. Apart from obvious points of similarity between a pair of "dictators", hardly more striking than such as hold between a Dionysius of Syracuse and an Oliver Cromwell, Napoleon and Hitler have hardly anything in common. All such rulers have to muzzle the press, and Napoleon must have his Fouché, Hitler his Goebbels. All must have spies; all must remove so-called traitors. All have to manipulate facts; Hitler minimizes defeats and magnifies victories. Napoleon adds thousands to the numbers of enemies slain, and describes Trafalgar in the *Moniteur* as "an engagement hastily entered into, which has led to the loss of a few ships". But to admit this is merely to say that both are despots who have risen from a lowly position, who must therefore hold their power in the traditional despotic fashion—the same, with the necessary differences due to time and place, as that by which the Greek tyrants maintained themselves. One may willingly admit that, as Napoleon was a Frenchman only by the accident that Corsica had recently been annexed, so Hitler was an Austrian; but this coincidence does not carry us far.

As a matter of fact, the prototype of Hitler is not Napoleon, but John of Leyden, or even one or other of the leaders of the innumer-

able sects that rose in England during the seventeenth century—Fifth Monarchists, Second Adventists, Ranters, Muggletonians. Amid the convulsions of the times, men looked forward to the speedy coming of Christ, fixed the date by twisting texts of *Daniel*, and described the event in terms of *Revelation*. Their minds had been prepared for these prophets by years of calamity. Thus they were only too eager to follow any guide who professed to be inspired, and when a prophet appeared, saying that he was the promised Messiah, or even God the Father, he found fanatical believers, ready to face imprisonment or death in his cause. To Oliver, and not least because he had some inclination to Fifth Monarchism himself, these men were more of a trouble than the Stuart or Scottish armies had ever been.

In a vastly wider sphere, the people of Germany were, in the 1930s, in a similar state of expectation. They had been defeated, they were still convulsed, and they were ready to welcome a Messiah—not of course a Jesus of Nazareth, but one such as Milton pictured, coming in clouds, bringing hideous ruin and combustion to their foes, convincing his people that their troubles were all due to the wicked foreigner, and that they had but to accept him and happiness would be theirs. For centuries they had been accustomed to yield obedience to authority; and here was one who easily assumed an authoritarian tone. He came primed with all the arts of theatrical and popular rhetoric, such, but highly magnified, as we have seen in windy and frantic revivalists. He is, perhaps, the greatest tub-thumper ever known; and he understood instinctively how to secure audiences which would respond to his appeals, and applaud his denunciations. These audiences, prepared long before, were still further moulded to his wish, their passions ready roused to the due uncritical pitch by music, speechifying, and every possible device. Then the magician would appear, and with voice and gesticulation—so violent that on the wireless it has agitated foreign listeners, even those who know no German—he would work his hearers into a perfect frenzy. *What* he said they scarcely knew; he often cannot have known it himself. To compare him with a revivalist of a very different kind, he could, like Whitefield, stir them to opposite emotions by pronouncing the word Mesopotamia with varying intonations. But, without understanding the speech, they could adore the speaker. As Mr. Mowrer has admirably described the four-hours' scene, it was positively overpowering; he looked on, and saw boys and girls, men and women, raving and howling like dervishes, and reduced, for the articulate expression of their emotions, to two mystic words, not dissimilar to those which religious men reserve for their Creator.

Not all Germans, naturally, were thus hypnotized. There were

many who saw their chance of utilizing the heaven-sent Messiah, soldiers who felt that he could rouse the spirit of the country to the level necessary for a war of revenge, and maintain it there; financiers like Thyssen who hoped to enlist his help in keeping the workers in their place; gangsters who under his ægis might make fortunes by plundering the Jews; enemies of Christianity who could substitute Odin for Christ. Besides these were the armies of flatterers who always hang on the skirts of the successful leader, and the equally large armies of those who, like the men of Sulla's proscriptions, could mask their private hatreds under the appearance of party-loyalty. To all this was speedily added the power of terror. Thousands of opponents were handed over to the savagery of concentration camps, and men who had aided him up to a point but would not go beyond it were ruthlessly murdered.

Where is the likeness between this man and the Emperor? Napoleon made his name by actions, not by words, and when he did use words, they were not a congeries of verbiage, but mainly short and telling phrases. He found France in a state of chaos, and very shortly, as has been well said, "confusion heard his voice and wild uproar stood ruled", but not by sheer terror. He certainly did not boggle at crime, but his crimes had purpose, and compared with Hitler's might seem venial. There is also in his career much that we can admire. "It is difficult", says Acton, "to exaggerate either the good or the bad"; but the bad, with Hitler in our mind, we think of as almost trifling. Jaffa is quite outclassed by Rotterdam. The execution of the Duke of Enghien, though an act of terrorism, was not altogether inexcusable. As for his treatment of prisoners, his most virulent English enemies, searching for something of the Hitlerian kind, could only discover the purely imaginary murder of Captain Wright. His invasion of Spain, one of his greatest mistakes, was certainly not unprovoked; and not even France herself was more devoted to him than Switzerland. Not least, he maintained the Republican system of freedom of religious opinion, and a Jew like Heine could worship him. A really pleasing trait in him is his willingness to confess his mistakes, and the generosity with which he would own the talents of some of his Marshals, as when he said that St. Cyr was at least his equal, and that before Masséna's genius one could but bow down in admiration. Hitler poses as a god; Napoleon declared, "I am not a man but an event".

It is needless to go further. Enough has been said to prove our point: the Führer is one kind of man, and the Emperor quite another. Let us hope, however, that they may be alike in their final failure when, to borrow words written in 1814, "God shall give deliverance to the oppressed, and to the injured power".

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

PUBLIC PRAYER—A BARRIER OR A BOND?

In one of the most provocative, and therefore attractive, autobiographies of recent times, Bishop Hensley Henson has something interesting to say[1] about liturgical and extempore prayer in its bearing upon Christian unity. He transcribes from his journal of July 28th, 1918, the Collect for the Day (the 9th Sunday after Trinity), and makes this comment:

> The collect for this Sunday is again one of the best, just precise enough for individual use, yet so general that a congregation can adopt it. *"Grant to us, Lord, we beseech thee, the spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful; that we, who cannot do anything that is good without thee, may by thee be enabled to live according to thy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen".* Contrast this prayer with the long and stilted improvisations to which one listens with almost physical anguish on occasions when "our Nonconformist brethren" join us in some public service. It is not conflicting dogmata which keep us apart, but inbred divergences of religious taste and habit. The Nonconformist finds our monotoned prayers little more than a meaningless babble; the Anglican finds their extemporaneous outpourings a well-nigh intolerable profanation. Apart, they can be wondrously fraternal: in actual contact, they could assassinate one another! This complicates the problem of Reunion very considerably, for our venturous efforts to bring the two parties together are apt to have the untoward effect of increasing their mutual disgust! We are actually driven to cherish isolation as the mother of civility, and of all other harmonious tempers! What a paradox!

Dr. Henson has always been the candid friend of the Free Churches, his candour and his friendship being in equal proportions, and both entirely sincere. This characteristically caustic paragraph is a case in point: while sincerely anxious to cultivate friendship between the Churches, he does not hesitate to say why he considers it almost impossible for the Anglican and the Nonconformist to dwell together in unity. With that pungency, not to say mordancy, which distinguishes his pen, he touches upon a deterrent to closer intercourse—public prayer. It almost goes without saying that prayer ought to draw people into oneness at the throne of grace, but Dr.

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, 297.

Henson points out that as a matter of fact it thrusts them apart. With careful impartiality he refuses to put the blame on either the one or the other of the parties concerned, but attributes it to "inbred divergences of religious taste and habit". What ought to be a common bond between Christian people is a barrier, and we echo the Bishop's exclamation: "What a paradox!"

Dr. Henson's comment was made in 1918, and we may note in passing that public prayer in the Free Churches has undergone considerable development since that date. At that time the long, extemporaneous prayer held sway in most of our churches. But changes were at hand: directed prayer began to be used; some of the great prayers of the ages were occasionally introduced; silent prayer was sometimes observed; and congregational responses to petitions were now and again called for—all these innovations being intended, consciously or unconsciously, to compensate for the deficiencies and ineffectiveness of the long prayer. Just how far our "extemporaneous outpourings" have been replaced by better ordered petitions it is impossible to say, but the evolution of prayer in our Free Churches during the last twenty-five years is significant of much, and it still goes on. Those "long and stilted improvisations" to which Dr. Henson has listened with almost physical anguish are becoming rarer in our Free Church pulpits, and perhaps they will soon be a thing of the past.

Is this change to be welcomed or deplored? One hopes that the day is past when a minister using a liturgical form of prayer laid himself open to the charge of "aping the Church of England"—an expression offensive in itself and not revealing a very kindly attitude toward our Anglican brethren. Why should we not learn from the Church of England if it has something to teach us? In any consideration of public prayer the *Book of Common Prayer* cannot be set aside as of no account: it is one of the noblest liturgies of the Christian Church—a liturgy that came to birth, like the English Bible upon which it is based, at a time when the language was at its purest and strongest; a liturgy, moreover, that has exercised a powerful and gracious influence upon generation after generation of Christian people in this land and in the Empire beyond the seas, as well as in the United States of America, for hundreds of years.

It does not follow that our Free Churches should adopt the Anglican Prayer Book: those "inbred divergences of religious taste and habit" make this impossible and undesirable; but there is every reason why we should use such prayers of the Anglican service as may seem helpful and that, with a freedom denied to the Established Church, we should avail ourselves of the devotional classics of the Universal Church.

If the matter were left to ministers, perhaps the majority of them would favour the final banishment of the long prayer from our services and the introduction of a more ordered form of worship. It stands to reason that only a spiritual genius is equal to offering an extemporaneous prayer that includes adoration, thanksgiving, confession, petition, intercession, in appropriate language twice every Sunday for forty-five Sundays in the year without lapses in taste, the repetition of unhelpful idiosyncrasies, a too personal emphasis upon certain aspects of truth, and the omission of themes for thanksgiving and intercession that are in the hearts of the congregation. Most ministers feel that too much is being asked of them, and if the question of the dropping of the omnibus prayer were put to a secret vote they would carry it by an overwhelming majority, some of them spoiling their ballot papers by adding ejaculations of gratitude that deliverance was at hand.

What would be the attitude of Free Church congregations? Greatly daring, I would express the opinion that our people are not so enamoured

of the exclusive use of extemporaneous prayer that they would mourn its partial eclipse. When directed prayer is introduced to churches unaccustomed to it and when ancient and beautiful prayers are read, congregations breathe a sigh of satisfaction; and the innovator is sometimes thanked for the relief he has brought to a long-suffering people—although the thanks are not expressed in quite those terms.

If a minister appears to have lost something of his hold upon his congregation after a lengthy pastorate it is generally assumed that it is his sermons that have become wearisome. He has said his say and there is no freshness in his message, is the complaint; it would be good for him and his people if he sought a change. But perhaps it is his prayers of which they have tired. A preacher of average education and ability can usually vary both the substance and style of his pulpit deliverances, and so save them from becoming monotonous, over a number of years, but to keep his pulpit prayers fresh is another matter. A natural delicacy prevents criticism of prayer, but sermons are fair game; and while a minister therefore strives to be effective in his preaching, he may fail lamentably with his prayers, and that without being conscious of his failure. If his people could be sure of a vital, arresting, and beautiful service they might overlook a mediocre sermon, but when both service and sermon are uninspiring the pews are sparsely occupied.

Against this it may be pointed out that the congregation at the neighbouring Anglican Church would be equally glad if their vicar, who has been with them many years, would take his departure; but it cannot have escaped the notice of the careful observer that discontent with a Church of England clergyman scarcely ever assumes so acute a form as discontent with a Free Church minister, nor does the work suffer to the same extent. After all, the good Anglican attending his parish church can always be sure of a service he knows and loves, and so be independent in a measure of the officiating clergyman. Not that an Anglican cannot appreciate a good sermon; he does; and when the beautiful service is combined with first-class preaching there is usually a full congregation. As a rule the Free Churchman has not the same comforting assurance about the service he attends, and cannot feel in any way independent of the minister in the pulpit. An undue responsibility falls upon the Nonconformist preacher: the whole service rests upon his shoulders, a burden almost too grievous to be borne.

A Free Church service of the conventional type consists as a rule of an opening hymn, an invocatory prayer, the Lord's Prayer (said or sung), a chant or anthem, the Lesson, a children's address and hymn, the longer prayer, the announcements and offering, another hymn, the sermon, a closing hymn, the Benediction—this or something like it. The old-fashioned custom of two Lessons—one from the Old Testament and another from the New—has frequently given way to one Lesson, and that sometimes of only a few verses—a deplorable economy in the interests of brevity. Is this diet sufficient for our spiritual nourishment, or is the ration too meagre? Does it contain the vitamins necessary for the vigorous health of mind and spirit?

The chief weakness of our services is that they do not draw sufficiently upon our Christian heritage. Prayers that have been offered for centuries by believing people, prayers that in their simplicity, comprehensiveness, and beauty have an everlasting appeal, are given no place, and this is a serious loss that no extemporaneous utterance, however apt or finely-phrased, can make good. When we reduce the reading of God's Word in church to a minimum we rob the congregation of a means of religious instruction that is specially needed at a time when the Bible is little read at home. To limit the people's opportunity of audibly joining in the worship of God to the

singing of the hymns and the saying or singing of the Lord's Prayer is a mistake that should be corrected. The well of Christian experience through the ages is deep; its waters are living; and we ought to draw upon them.

At this point the patient reader may lose his patience. He may retort that the service of worship in the church he attends meets every need. The hymns are heartily sung; the Scriptures of both Testaments are read without stint; extempore prayer is offered with sincerity and power; and the whole service is rounded off with a sermon that instructs and inspires. Everything that a liturgy could give in dignity and beauty is found in such a service, and no embellishments are required. The prayers especially are a means of grace. The minister, a man of spiritual insight who knows how to clothe spiritual aspirations in fitting language, leads his people unto the Mount of Vision and into the presence of the Most High God. When he prays things of earth and time fall away; the spiritual world becomes real; the penitent sinner is brought to the footstool of Divine grace; the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows, of the human heart are laid open before the loving Father; vows are taken, and every worshipper, on rising from his knees, knows himself to be a dedicated spirit—renewed and strengthened for the battle of life. Why try to improve upon so satisfying a service?

In one of Thomas Hardy's novels, *A Laodicean*, George Somerset draws a contrast between a country Baptist chapel, "which had neither beauty, quaintness, nor congeniality to recommend it", and "the scenes of venerable Gothic art" in which he had lately passed his time:

> The chapel and its shabby plot of ground, from which the herbage was all trodden away by busy feet, had a living human interest that the numerous minsters and churches, knee-deep in fresh green grass, visited by him during the foregoing week, had often lacked. . . . The building was quite full of people belonging to that vast majority of society who are denied the art of articulating their higher emotions, and crave dumbly for a fugleman—respectably dressed working people whose faces and forms were worn and contorted by years of dreary toil. On a platform at the end of the chapel a haggard man of more than middle age, with grey whiskers ascetically cut back from the fore part of his face so far as to be almost banished from the countenance, stood reading a chapter.

This looks like an authentic picture of rural Nonconformity of sixty years ago, the lines somewhat harshly drawn perhaps, but faithful in its essential features. Here we see those "inbred divergencies of taste and habit" which divide the Dissenter from the Churchman, and it is the pride of England that from her soil she has produced both. The Nonconformist and the Anglican are true sons of the household, natives of a land that has room for many "varieties of religious experience".

It is not suggested that this type of Nonconformity could benefit from the introduction of any element of liturgical worship, and, in so far as this type survives today, it will best serve the present age by adhering to its historic witness: modifications of its simple service of praise, prayer, and preaching would only spoil it. It was a Baptist chapel in the country that Thomas Hardy described, and it is probably among the Baptists of today that the old-fashioned Nonconformity is most alive and flourishing. We thank God for the "Bethels", the "Bethesdas", and the "Zoars" which dot some stretches of the English countryside, beacons of light in bygone years, and still shining. Rural Congregationalism is often of the same order, and the Methodist village chapel, largely dependent upon the ministrations of the local preacher, also provides a non-liturgical and informal type of service.

Far from disparaging the worth and influence of such places of worship we rejoice in them. The mosaic of religious life in this country is many-coloured: John Henry Newman and Charles Haddon Spurgeon were both Englishmen.

Because there is a section of Nonconformity antipathetic to every change in its forms of worship, it does not follow that the majority of Free Churchmen would not welcome considerable developments along the lines suggested. If our churches are truly free, they are as free to make experiments in worship as in methods of raising money, and if the same thought and ingenuity were devoted to the former as to the latter, we could expect progress. Our forefathers rejected the Anglican Prayer Book in the name of religious liberty, and in the name of religious liberty we may be led to discard the form of service observed in our churches today in favour of one more in keeping with present needs.

There are those who will object to any change from our accustomed ways, and these ritualists of Nonconformity may be a stumbling-block; but there is a spirit of adventure among our younger people that will not be satisfied with things as they are, and they have a right to be heard. These matters must be decided pragmatically: if the present type of service commands the hearty approval of the people, well and good; but if not, let us be fearless in exploring new methods. Most of us are conservative in religious affairs, and in our innate dislike of change we may discover a new attractiveness in old paths. The reaction to what is here proposed may be an outburst of ecstatic praise for the dear old-fashioned service to which we have all been accustomed since childhood's days!

Would such protestations ring true? Do our services call forth the sincere appreciation of our people? If they do, then all that has been written above may well be unwritten; but can we honestly say that the average congregation feels such satisfaction with the service provided that it desires no change? Happily there are ministers among us, not all of them the best known, who are peculiarly fitted to conduct public worship on the old lines; but they are exceptional. This is a case in which the best is the enemy of the good and the not so good; and we must not allow the exceptions to blind us to general conditions.

It may be contrary to the genius of Nonconformity to have a prescribed prayer book: most of those prepared for this purpose, such as the *Book of Congregational Worship* and *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer*, have not been widely adopted. We are still in the experimental stage, and many more experiments must be made before we find types of service that will be generally welcomed. In the nature of the case this is mainly a task for ministers, and they will address themselves to it with the desire to make a contribution to what should be a widespread endeavour to enrich the devotional part of our services from every helpful source. The result might be a liturgy capable of change and adaptation to special needs and circumstances. It would probably include the General Thanksgiving, the General Confession, the best of the collects and litanies, both ancient or modern, which give the congregation an audible part in intercession; and, along with this, such spontaneous prayer as the minister feels called upon to offer. Dean Church once expressed the opinion that it was "more spiritual to pray out of a book, because then we can be sure of having the most beautiful and most spiritual words to pray in", and, without agreeing with such a view, we can believe that liturgical and extempore prayer are equally spiritual. To pass from a read to a free prayer should be a perfectly natural procedure—two ways of approaching God that have been consecrated by Christian people in every generation.

When both order and freedom mark our public prayers each will strengthen the other. A service strictly liturgical from which no deviation is allowed is in danger of lapsing into formalism and may be devoid of expectancy: a service in which prayer is entirely extemporaneous lacks that comprehensiveness and dignity of expression which come from the spiritual experience of past ages; but, when the two are combined, we shall worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness; and prayer, liturgical or free, will no longer be a barrier between Christians, but an unbreakable bond.

JOHN A. PATTEN.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA AND THE INDIAN CHRISTIAN HERITAGE.

THE Church Union movement in South India has now reached a critical stage, with the recommendation of the Joint Committee, comprising the official delegates of the Church of India, the Methodist Church, and the South India United Church, that the Proposed Scheme be not further amended, and that the Churches concerned be asked to vote whether they are prepared to unite on the basis of the Scheme as it now stands. The Methodist Church has already indicated its willingness to accept the Scheme, and the formal and final vote will be taken shortly. The Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon will be able to take their vote early in 1944, and there is every expectation that it will be favourable. The South India United Church, comprising eight Church Councils, of which four are Councils originating from work connected with the London Missionary Society, is in a more difficult position, since three of the Councils, and these three[1] connected with the L.M.S., are divided upon the question of this Scheme and have not yet found it possible to agree to enter the proposed union. One of these three, in fact, has rejected the Scheme *in toto*.

It will be readily understood that Churches brought up under Congregational influence do not find it easy to accept a Scheme which is based upon general acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and upon the Historic Episcopate, which excludes Lay Celebration of the Sacraments, and which severely limits the independence of the individual congregation. I do not propose here to enter into the merits and demerits of the Scheme from any doctrinal or ecclesiastical standpoint; but I wish to discuss briefly the question how far the present Scheme allows for the development of a truly indigenous Indian type of Christianity. The Telugu Church Council of the South India United Church, in rejecting the present scheme, resolved *inter alia*:

> We desire therefore that the S.I.U.C. lay aside the Scheme and explore the possibilities of a wider Federal Union of Churches *upon a simpler and freer basis, more suited to Indian conditions and Indian thought*, and with more freedom for local variety of practice until such time as a more united mind arises and an organic union upon an agreed basis commands the assent of a larger majority.

How far is this implied criticism of the Scheme justified—that it fails in simplicity and freedom, and is not suited to Indian conditions and Indian thought?

(1) *Organization.* The present Scheme of Union envisages a large Church of about a million members, centrally governed, with a close organization of Pastorates, Diocesan Councils, and a Church Synod, the latter to

[1] One has now dropped its objections and agreed to the Scheme.

be the "supreme governing and legislative body of the Church of South India, and the final authority in all matters pertaining to the Church", with "power to make rules . . . and take executive action . . . for the general management and good government of the Church and of the property and affairs thereof". Is such an organization of the Church in line with the spirit of the Indian religious heritage?

To ask the question is at once to answer it. Centralization of authority in religion is entirely foreign to the Indian religious genius: and the American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions criticized the Scheme from that standpoint. In Hinduism and in Islam there is nothing to correspond to such Church organization on the religious side. In any village or town there is provision for Hindu religious worship, both congregational, family, and individual, and facilities for spiritual culture of all kinds. There are also religious communities scattered over an area with a common loyalty to some *Guru*, temple or *ashram*. But there is no rigid organization, the community being kept together by an inward loyalty and fellowship which have resulted in a spiritual freedom and tolerance which is typical of Hindu religious culture, and which is in many ways a reproach to the intolerance of certain sections of the Christian Church. Hinduism knows no Church government comparable to our Western system, nor ecclesiastical control by any legislative or governing body in religious matters; but there is a supreme recognition of the intangible spiritual character of religion, and a resultant solidarity and atmosphere in which sectarianism and bigotry find it difficult to thrive. Matters are very similar in the fellowship of Islam.

Are we to argue that, in contrast to Hinduism and Islam, Christianity cannot flourish in India without a rigid centralization of religious authority? Is there nothing at all in the Congregational witness of the spiritual competence of the "gathered" Church? Can the Indian Christian Church, with its heritage of free association and spiritual solidarity, really be expected to thrive under a system so foreign to its own feeling and experience?

(2) *Episcopacy*. The Scheme provides for the unification of the ministry of the Church under the Historic Episcopate. The present non-episcopally ordained ministers are allowed to continue for a period of thirty years, but all new ordinations are to be performed by the Bishops. No particular interpretation of this Historic Episcopacy is required doctrinally, but continuity with the Early Church through the succession of Bishops is to be preserved.

It may be freely admitted that Episcopacy as a form of Church Government, if given an Indian orientation, can be brought into line with the Indian religious heritage, and would be beneficial to the Indian Church at its present stage. But the idea implied in Historic Episcopacy of a personal succession of Bishops through the ages which must at all costs be preserved intact, and that only presbyters ordained by such Bishops can exercise a regular ministry in the Church, finds no parallel in Indian thought or practice; in fact, Indian thought, except where it has been prejudiced by previous Church tradition from the West, rebels against such a conception.

In Hinduism, the religious teacher and spiritual mentor is the *Guru;* but his relationship to his disciples does not consist in the exercise of authority and discipline through any organization, but is one of freedom and reverence in spiritual matters. The Hindu *Guru* is not burdened with matters of administration, but is a religious teacher and father and guide, holding his position amongst his flock by his personal character and religious pre-

eminence alone. There is no notion that *Guruship* is passed on by a succession of an outward kind, and the *Guru* does not attempt any rule over any organized body.

The Syrian Churches in Travancore are said to work under a system which combines Episcopacy with Congregationalism, and it is along these lines that a true, indigenous Indian Episcopacy might be developed. The ideals of democracy have become so widespread in India today that any movement which tends against it, or to enhance the power of the clergy as against the laity is bound to meet with severe and increasing criticism.

(3) *The Sacraments.* In the proposed Scheme of Union, the celebration of the two Sacraments is strictly limited to the ordained presbyters and bishops. Lay Celebration is ruled out altogether.

In Indian thought, the unit in the religious sphere is the family, the head of which is the family priest, conducting by virtue of his position as the senior male member the sacraments (*samskaras*) of religion. *Gurus* or *pujaris* may be called in on special occasions, but the real rites of Hinduism are family rites, performed by the head of the house.

The proposed Scheme of Union reserves the administration of the Sacraments of Christianity as a sacerdotal function to be performed only by ordained priests. Is this in line with Indian thought and practice? Even in Islam, which is more highly organized than Hinduism, there is no sacrament which can only be administered in the mosque by a priest. Moreover, it is on the question of the administration of Sacraments that the Church in South India is most divided.

There is a movement afoot to solve this problem by taking the matter outside of the organized Church (*cf. The Guardian,* Madras, 25th Sept., 1941). It is argued that Christianity was originally a family religion, and that the real officials of the Church were the heads of the Christian families. The Holy Communion was also originally a joyous meal celebrated in homes where Christians met, presided over by the head of the house, who combined in himself the kingly and priestly functions. It is further argued that one of the greatest weaknesses of the present-day institutionalized Church is that the family is no longer recognized as the religious unit, and that the place of the heads of the families in the functioning of religion has been usurped by paid hierarchical officials who magnify their office and themselves at the expense of the vitality of religion in the home. It is suggested that priests should be allowed to continue to celebrate Communion in the church, but that laymen should assert their right to celebrate communion among themselves outside the church. It is claimed that this is entirely in accordance with oriental ideas.

This movement, at present small, may soon grow amongst the laymen of the Church if a strict hierarchical rule by the clergy according to the proposed Scheme becomes an actuality. The layman is as a rule more sensitive to the tendencies of Indian thought and culture than the ecclesiastic, and no Scheme of Union is likely to succeed which confines the sacramental to the priest alone.

(4) *Worship.* In general, the proposed Scheme allows freedom in forms of worship; actually this freedom is limited in many ways, especially in the services of Baptism, Holy Communion, and Ordination. Hindu worship is essentially sacramental worship, and thus if the sacramental services of the new Church are so closely prescribed, there is very little real freedom left, and very little scope allowed for the fusing of indigenous forms of worship with traditional forms from the West.

In the Scheme of Union, it is laid down that the two Sacraments shall be ministered "with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution". This seems to be a mere relic of a past age, when Biblical scholarship had scarcely begun. In regard to Baptism, what are these words? The Anglican Prayer Book refers to *Jn.* 3^5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God". But how many modern scholars would be prepared to accept these words as the literal utterance of Christ? The Prayer Book then goes on to refer to *Mk.* 16^{16}, which even a Christian High School boy should know is not part of the original Gospel of Mark and certainly not the original word of Jesus. With regard to the Communion, is it intended to use *Matt., Mk., Lk.,* or Paul, or a conflation of all of them, as the Anglican Prayer Book appears to do? (And what about the shorter version of *Lk.,* which at any rate has better textual authority than *Mk.* 16^{16}?)

In conclusion, it must be realized that the Indian Christian Church in South India has not yet come to the point where it fully knows its own mind. On the other hand, it has a religious heritage of no mean order and one which can and ought to be used to the fullest possible extent so that it may not only form a natural home for Indian Christians, but contribute by its particular genius to the universal apprehension of Christ. But so long as the hand of Western Christianity presses heavily upon it, so long will it remain a foreign element, and repel rather than attract the national elements in India.

It is claimed also that a spirit of Protestantism is latent in the Indian mind, and already we see all over South India the growth of sects which attempt to cater to the spiritual needs of Church rebels in a more serious, if less sober and intelligent, manner than the greater denominational Churches. The formation of a large organized Church without a large freedom for variety of practice and belief will inevitably bring separatist movements of an undesirable kind, and thus the very attempt at Union may assist the forces of disunion.

The present urge to Free Church Union in Britain seems to offer a far more natural step to wider union than an attempted Union at the present time between evangelical and sacramentarian Churches as we have it in South India. Would it not be wiser also to go slowly in this matter out here, until we see what will be the effect of the War upon the Churches in the Home countries with which the Churches of South India are still so closely connected?

H. V. Martin.

RELIGION IN WAR-TIME AUSTRALIA.

The dislocation of normal life caused by the war is much the same here as in Britain, though on a smaller scale. Its effect on religion awakens both misgiving and encouragement. Whether we are gaining or losing is difficult to say; we note menacing and hopeful signs as they emerge and daily revise our estimate, aware always that we live by faith and hope. Constant observation is needed, that we may set our course the more faithfully, but, be the weather foul or fair, we are sustained by the thought that we sail the seas with God.

Reviewing the situation, then, and noting first consequences visible in church life, the result is misgiving relieved by gleams of possible good. Many are being detached from religious observance, and connections so broken will be hard to renew. National Days of Prayer—we have had eight since the war began—bring increased numbers to church, but nowhere

have services been packed as they were on the first occasion, when the unexpected, dramatic submission of France landed our century-old complacency one between the eyes. Then chairs were in the aisles; the startled crowds began to feel much as its Governor felt when the situation at Singapore became hopeless; "we are now in God's hands", he announced. And no doubt many echoed the remark made by a young officer when he heard the Governor's declaration: "That's torn it, they've passed the buck to the Almighty". But cynical comments on stampedes for shelter are only part of the truth; although the fall of Malaya and Java and the first scorching of our northern ports failed to bring such crowds again, the increased attendances on these days have spoken of more than fear; there are many who seek a deeper anchorage for faith. It is not being manifested, however, in larger attendance at the ordinary church services. Military requirements to some extent explain this; most of our youth are under arms, labour everywhere is being called up for war work, our young women are enrolling fast in auxiliary services, many of our older men are engaged in activities connected with Air-Raid Precautions and Citizens' Defence organizations, while brown- and black-outs with resultant change to afternoon services prevent many from attending.

The outlying parts of a country but thinly populated are quickly robbed of regular church services when war threatens. Rural ministers and missionaries are usually younger men, and chaplaincy needs plus a cessation of recruits from the colleges compel the closing of mission stations here and there, and a restriction of services in other places, unless some kind of amalgamation with neighbouring districts is possible. Where the mileage to be covered is large, petrol shortage cuts out regular ministration. It cannot yet be said that this has meant much co-operation between denominations, too often, alas, competitors in country towns. Yet there are signs that reassure; steadily amid what disintegrates the sense of our underlying unity grows.

In one of our capital cities Baptists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians have combined their morning services, and so have freed two ministers for work elsewhere. This is not the usual grouping; Baptists and Churches of Christ, more akin in theological outlook, who in other States are exploring the prospect of union, and Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, who twenty years ago projected union, and who form a larger group with many active affiliations, better represent the alignment. This experiment of uniting in worship, we hear, is working well; it would be good if it were followed in other cities. Morning congregations generally are few in numbers. There is little definite to report concerning union between the three last-mentioned bodies; they are again approaching the question through their higher courts, but it cannot be said that vigorous leadership determined to consummate union is noticeable. Yet the view becomes stronger that a far greater degree of co-operation, if not actual union itself, must be brought about. In several of the States for years past these three communions have united in training their ministers. New Zealand shows them nearer each other: there a basis of union has been drawn up, and Methodists are referring it to their Synods and Quarterly Meetings for consideration.

The work of an inter-communion group which has been meeting in Sydney for over four years is of interest, though the war situation has not accelerated its efforts. It looks for a solution of difficulties experienced in the mission fields of the South Pacific, and is preparing for circulation a statement explanatory of its proposals. In Papua and elsewhere, where the Missionary Societies have distinct provinces allotted to them, migration of

natives makes it desirable that they should be free to receive ministrations from others than those of their own church when away from home. The solution suggested takes the form of a ministerial commission, which does not in any sense imply re-ordination of those who accept it, but qualifies them for a ministry embracing other Churches also. The discussions, inevitably, have brought to the front the position in Australia also. One Archbishop opposes the suggested solution out of consideration for those who contend that the validity of the Communion Service depends on the elements being consecrated by one who has received episcopal ordination to the priesthood, a view many Anglicans here maintain. Non-episcopal members of the group, desiring only a formal commission to preach and administer the sacraments in each branch of the Church, which would suffice if their respective ministries were recognized, feel that the proposals leave things much as they are. For Anglican members have always been welcome to receive communion at the hands of non-Anglican ministers. But non-Anglican members, if they wished to receive it in an Anglican church, would still need to be confirmed, unless it were only now and then. This extension of the question, however, lies beyond the immediate aim of the group, which seeks first a common ministry that will make occasional hospitality possible in the mission field. The more sympathetic understanding of each other's convictions gained in the group and the deeper realization of oneness it has fostered, justify its continuance in the search for a common formula, though formulæ too often are but superficial agreements which leave unreconciled fundamental differences. Still, the more earnest minds in all the Churches are some guarantee that the dissatisfaction with things as they are—a dissatisfaction the war is steadily increasing—will find expression at last in the spirit of Christ wherein we all are one.

So much for church life during the war. Now for evidences of religion in the life of the people at large, the religious spirit apart from its allegiance to churches and their doctrines. One bane of Australian life has been its insularity. Safe for years behind its unearned increment, the Maginot line of distance, its people became imbued with the idea that they could work out their destiny on their own. The average politician, with but little orientation of empire, let alone of world affairs, and usually but an instrument of the class interests behind him, sees only what is in front of his eyes. But "what do they know of Australia who only Australia know?" Now has come the awakening and the knowledge that we are members one of another. Even our White Australia policy, sacrosanct to most, yet so farcical at times in its administration, has been badly jolted in many minds. This self-centred attitude, with its insistence on rights to the exclusion of duties, has been reinforced by the materialistic temper which, in its haste to get rich, has exploited and impoverished our natural resources. In many ways we have raped our virgin lands. With thousands out of reach of the churches, and with indifference as the prevailing attitude to religion in our cities—and they contain more than half our population—we have bred a race eager to take any short cut that promises what it desires, and a spirit all too ready to blame others.

That the war should increase dislike of moral restraint, even while it elicits finer characteristics, is therefore understandable. Where abnormal conditions press, the safeguards that hitherto protected Sunday are toppling over. Of the thousands of American and Australian troops in camp throughout the Commonwealth the small proportion who usually attended church continue to do so, if the fresh faces seen at most services are any indication. But the many who lack the church-going habit require something to occupy their time, so Sunday evening entertainments everywhere

are being organized. Usually these do not begin until church services are almost over; they should not interfere much with the existing order, especially where the cinema has been open on Sundays. Even with hospitality and social intercourse provided by churches and people in their homes, there remain large numbers to whom this form of entertainment is more acceptable. Church opinion is not unanimous regarding these Sunday shows. Some think the abnormal situation warrants them; far better such than what might easily be worse. And why should we force on others a respect for the day they do not feel? On the other hand, many will be forced to work on their one day of rest. A Gallup poll just taken is strongly in favour of the proposals; there is a majority, however, against such entertainments being open to the public. The main fear of those who look at the moral results is that the pleasure-loving forces which ceaselessly attack the Sunday quiet will here gain ground; it would be difficult to bar friends and relatives from accompanying soldiers. Whatever the solution, and each side has a case, it is likely to dissolve still further reverence for the one day in the week when opportunity is provided for reinforcing in fellowship man's spiritual vision and resources.

Drunkenness in many quarters has increased. Disgraceful scenes in our cities compelled the Government to reduce hotel hours; the demand for this came not only from the forces always opposed to the traffic; moderate drinkers everywhere denounced the excesses and called for restriction. But the after-hours drinking that goes on in clubs, with its unfair provision for those who are members, has not been attacked. That so many girls and young women fill hotel lounges aroused widespread condemnation. We have not been as drastic as New Zealand, where women are refused drink in hotel lounges after 5 p.m., but there has been some lessening in the evil since hours were shortened and rationing introduced, although the sale of bottled beer, which is consumed after hours, and increased resort to the wine shops, still do incalculable harm. A disquieting feature is the disrespect for law thus engendered. Those in authority too often lack courage to uphold the laws; fear of losing votes paralyses them. The same fear nullifies decisive measures against gambling, which has an annual turnover of about two hundred million pounds. The Premier of one State has prohibited all racing, otherwise the Federal and State authorities play battledore and shuttlecock in throwing the responsibility on each other's shoulders.

Yet underneath the swirling of a people's life there moves a spirit increasingly intent upon the application of moral principles to man's social and every-day well-being. In the prosecution of the war our unanimity is disturbed by but few pacifists, and the tribunals which deal with objectors try fairly to acknowledge the claims of conscience. Encouraging also was the protest heard in all the States when the Government in a series of propaganda talks sponsored speakers who descended to meaningless abuse against the Japanese. Something of the Christian temper undoubtedly inspired the protests, which showed how strong is the conviction that we must fight with clean hands. Then here, as elsewhere, although the prospect of rationing resulted in shops being rushed for clothing and footwear, the majority have displayed a more unselfish attitude. The general interest in post-war problems, shown in innumerable groups bent on clarifying what is essential to any new order, may be inspired by a humanism saturated with Christian teaching, yet many are probing through this in search of a religious sanction for their ideals. This urge to something deeper, unconsciously testifying to the value of the Barthian emphasis as a corrective to superficial social idealism, would not support the extreme alternatives of that theology; it does confirm the wider religious view that this also is God's

world, and that we must seek to establish His kingdom here. It is not too much to say that whatever may be the estimate of the Church's effectiveness in achieving that end, there is widespread the desire to set up a new order founded on the Christian ethic. And if this in practice may mean curbing the individual, the recognition that self-discipline is necessary is being accepted by many. Also, in this newer land which calls for independence and initiative, there is enough of reverence for personality and its rights to be a safeguard against regulations which may threaten to become tyrannical.

So, alongside Britain, we share her struggle and her hopes. The German who once derided the British Empire as being something held together by moonbeams might even more have scorned our Christian faith, which rests on intangibles. And the answer would have been the same, that though you may bomb the moonbeams, and slash them with swords, they are still there. Amid all that confuses and perturbs, we fight and strive for what is indestructible.

GEORGE H. WRIGHT.

Mr. Gerhard Leibholz's *Christianity, Politics, and Power* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is a useful *Christian News-Letter Book*. Its author is a Lutheran, and we are learning from the Lutherans in these days, both what to do and what to avoid. Mr. Leibholz argues that

> the Church must be political, and even highly political, and that the Christian faith is of incalculable political value.

The fact that the Church has largely identified itself or allowed the State to identify it with an unchristian policy makes it all the more urgent that the Church must find a way to make good the harm it has done. We should have liked a little more of the author, even at the expense of his authorities, whom he quotes without any uniformity and sometimes with slips. In a dozen pages we have (readers can correct and make uniform): McIver, John Middleton Murry, A. I. Toynbee, J. Stuart Mill, Burke, Dr. Cole, E. Burke, Dr. Quick, Niebuhr, McIver, Christopher Dawson, Mr. Eliot, F. A. Cockin, W. James, A. R. Vidler, Mr. Eliot, Tawney, Bishop of Chichester, Ruskin, Stopford Brooke.

The Rev. W. A. Whitehouse has translated *The Abolition of Christianity* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), by Mr. John Maarten, the author of *The Village on the Hill*. This "Diary of a Disturbed Soul" reveals the concern—and more than concern—for organized Christianity which has long marked our own pages:

> Christianity no longer takes any risks. It is shown up every time by common soldiers and revolutionaries. It seeks every opportunity of impressing upon itself the need for staying quietly indoors.

It no longer believes in the disturbing power of the Holy Spirit or in a resurrection which would upset and revolutionize. It

> took the sting out of God's revolution . . . [and] leaves to others the blood-stained paving-stones and barricades, the heroic death of political martyrdom. Christianity is determined to keep its mouth shut.

Nevertheless, there are still Christians who believe and live in the power of their belief. And they may save Christianity, which is otherwise doomed.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

LIFE IN 17TH CENTURY WARWICKSHIRE.

It is good to know that there are places where research work destined to be of permanent use can be continued. Far too often nowadays the student finds himself baffled; he goes to the Rylands Library in Manchester and learns of a manuscript he requires to see, "Inaccessible for the duration"; he visits the British Museum—and what a pathetic sight the deserted and unused Reading Room is—and of other manuscripts hears: "Perhaps they might have been obtained for you, but when the Baedeker raids started we took further steps to ensure their safety, and now they are unobtainable". Disconsolately he betakes himself across the Atlantic, but alike in the Folger Library in Washington and the Huntington Library in California he finds much has been sent inland. Of the many disservices Herr Schickelgrüber has rendered to truth this interruption of research must be counted one.

But on the table before me is Vol. VI of the *Warwick County Records*. It can be obtained from the Shire Hall, Warwick, for 10s. 6d. What the county of Warwick has done to deserve its good fortune we do not know, but those responsible should receive all possible praise for the continued publication of the County Records; apparently the credit is due to the Records Committee, who further reveal their wisdom by reminding local authorities of the danger of loss of local records through war damage or salvage enthusiasm, and encourage them to deposit their treasures in the County Muniment Rooms. *O si sic omnes!*

These County Records have from the first been a model. The Committee were fortunate in securing two ideal editors, as competent as they are enthusiastic, Mr. S. C. Ratcliff and Mr. H. C. Johnson, and readers can assume that documents are correctly copied and the Index (in this volume 100 pp. to 240 pp. of text) all an Index should be.

Vol. VI contains the Quarter Sessions Indictment Book from Easter, 1631, to Epiphany, 1674. It is a well preserved and beautifully written manuscript, which makes me green with envy after spending weeks trying to read John Penry's prison note-book. The volume presents a picture of life in 17th century England seen from the misdemeanour angle. It is interesting to try to construct for one's self from the items here provided the scene in Shakespeare's England a generation after his day.

The first impression is of the number of presentments for neglecting to repair roads and bridges: sometimes individuals are the culprits, but often all the inhabitants of a town or village. It is evident that constant efforts had to be made to compel people to do their part in making even local travel possible; and sometimes the sins were sins of commission, as offenders either took from the road or added to it for their own convenience. In 1651, for example, Bridget Linedon of Sowtham, a widow whom I suppose we must call a lady, was fined for the double offence of "erecting an house of office to the annoyance of people passing to church" and "laying a dunghill in the way to the church". In this regard we have the use of the word "annoy" in a sense now obsolete, as when Thomas Orton of Napton was presented in 1635 for "stopping and annoying a watercourse in the common street of Napton by laying a dunghill". Clearly many individuals disregarded community rights and took all they could and gave as little. Men

were presented for "omitting six days' labour", sometimes with their teams, for not scouring their ditches (even William Shakespeare of Rowington had to be fined in 1664 for this offence), and for watering flax and hemp in the brook.

A great many entries deal with the sale of liquor. Thus, about the same time, Easter, 1671, Robert Randall, a victualler, is presented "for keeping tippling and disorders in his house in time of divine service" and "Cæsar Wyncote of Kennelworth, for not selling a quart of ale for a penny" (can you not imagine the excitement such an entry would cause in many bar-parlours in 1942? There are many indictments for selling less than a quart of ale for a penny). Perhaps the frequent entries about drinking are not unconnected with the "riotous" and other assaults which appear on almost every page. Many Warwickshire residents seem to have taken the law into their own hands, which is perhaps not surprising when the weakness of the local executive is remembered. Thus

> Thomas Quiney of Wolfehampcott, yeoman, presented for that he, being constable there, did not execute a warrant of sir John Knightley, baronet, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace,

while there are several cases of extortion from arrested persons. One such case is thus described:

> John Terrey of Franckton, husbandman, indicted for keeping William Adkins (after he arrested him) at a common alehouse without his consent and forcing of him to spend five shillings in beer and ale, etc., contrary to the form of the statute.

There is a good deal of petty theft, for which whipping is sometimes ordered, for women as well as men, and much shooting of pigeons and tracing of hares, William Jackson of Middleton aggravating the last offence in 1635 by "tracing a hare in the snow upon the Sabbath day in the time of divine service until he killed her": this seems a sad descent from Benaiah, subject of many a children's address, who "slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow". William Raynbow of Napton seems to have been an unpleasant neighbour, for in 1665 he is fined both "for not keeping a sufficient mound between him and Richard Wright", and "for keeping a dog that is mankind unmuzzled".

Forestalling and false measures are regular offences, with "the buying and selling of corn with an unlawful strike contrary to the standard". Many entries have to do with straying and impounded cattle, and with various forms of trespass. There is much "encroachment on" and "oppression of" commons, while those who attempt to "enclose the king's highway" are apparently sometimes caught, though protesting their innocence. On the contrary, many offenders have failed to add 4 acres of land to cottages they have built. Only one "common scold" appears, and she from Birmingham, the wife of a "knife-cutler", and she was discharged. Lest the sex be exalted over-much, it must be pointed out that women were often engaged in the "riotous assaults".

Recently some enthusiastic contributor to the religious press (and he a Free Churchman) advocated compulsory church attendance. Plainly he should have lived in Warwickshire in the 17th century. Probably there are more presentments in these records for not coming to church than for any other offence. Sometimes the number of Sundays or the period of absence is stated, sometimes the fact that the offenders are recusants. Generally this means Roman Catholicism (once they are called "Popish recusants") but probably not always. Our Free Church advocate of compulsion would be interested in

> Lawrence Cowper of Rowington, blacksmith, and his wife, for not resorting to their parish church and for not receiving the sacrament and not baptizing their children lawfully.

"Be my brother or I will kill you", cried the revolutionary; "Come to the Lord's Table, Lawrence, or go to gaol"; would this be the attitude of this Free Churchman to the blacksmith and his wife?

All kinds of offences assume a deeper dye when committed on Sunday or in time of divine service—drinking, "shooting in a gun on the Sabbath day and killing a pigeon therewith", "keeping disorder in his house in time of divine service". In 1669 Anthony Hicking of Wootton is presented for two offences, and fined for both; not only does he not go to church to hear divine service, but he is a "nightwalker", whatever that may be. Probably he was undisturbed by any black-out, and knew all about the phases of the moon.

The Civil War and the furious controversies of the times are scarcely reflected at all in these records, though it would be interesting to learn more of

> Joseph Baker of Birmingham, sadler, indicted for saying the Book of Common Prayer is mere popery and those that take part with it are no better than papists *On the statute of* (*blank*) *Elizabeth.*

This was in 1642; there is no indication of any punishment; perhaps the justices could not find under what Statute of Elizabeth Joseph was indictable, perhaps they were not unsympathetic with his assertions.

Six years later, Valentine Jackson, clerk, late of Maxstocke, showed that he was of another opinion, for he was twice indicted "for using the Book of Common Prayer contrary to the ordinance of Parliament".

With the Restoration and the Clarendon Code evidences of Protestant non-conformity appear. Local Congregational historians may know something of a conventicle at "Lemington Priours". On 7th March. 1664, Hugh Bates, miller, "late of Lemington Priours", was

> present at an unlawful assembly and conventicle . . . for the exercise of religion and continuing there a quarter of an hour against the form of the statute etc and against the peace etc.

Mr. Bates, and William Hayle, late of Ofchurch, labourer, William Page, late of Ofchurch, labourer, William Knibb, late of Leekewootton, yeoman, Edward Page, late of Ofchurch, yeoman, William Greene, late of the city of Coventry, labourer, Nicholas Falkener, late of Warwick, yeoman, who were all at the same conventicle, must have had a very short sermon. Nevertheless they were nearly all fined (Page's entry is: *"Traversed in Michaelmas 1664 for the defendant"*). And what is the significance of "late of"? Does it mean they were already in prison, or had they moved further afield beyond the reach of the law?

In 1665 three husbandmen at Napton on the Hill, and three of Nether Shuckborough are "presented for being at a private meeting and conventicle"; here in each case the entry reads, *"Traversed by the defendants"*.

In 1670 "Samuel Smith of Kennelworth" was indicted for keeping a conventicle in his house there, and "Widow Read, of the same . . . for the like".

From 1670 the annual returns of fines for conventicles are included, the Conventicle Act of that year having enacted that one-third of the fines imposed by the Justices should go to the Crown. The editors point out that for this, as for other offences, the fines were much lighter than those prescribed by the Statutes. Some student should examine the names in these

"fine" returns, and endeavour to classify them into Roman and Protestant non-conformists. There is no doubt about Robert Rotheram, David Blackham, and Thomas Edwards, all of Birmingham, for against each, in 1671, is "for a Quaker".

* * *

Reports of the proceedings in Police Courts today would not, of course, give a true picture of Britain in 1942. Certainly they would not reflect so much of the life of ordinary folk as do these Warwickshire records, so effectively brought to the light of this modern day.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

ENGLISH conservatism proved to be a stronger force than anything Germany seemed to have at her disposal to meet the disintegrating influence of the industrial age. This conservatism is in many ways an enigma for the nations on the Continent. They find it hard to understand a mind ready to leave an important issue in the balance, not deciding one way or the other, yet accepting this state of indecision and suspense as a perfectly happy solution. That two conflicting ideas should not be pursued until they openly clash, that it should be possible to accept both, a compromise being found or tacitly taken for granted—this English attitude and practice is often admired by Germans as the clear manifestation of "world-wise" shrewdness, very appropriate for men of affairs, but it is not regarded as a token of sincerity; it is believed to be a mask. Schopenhauer called Dr. Johnson's Anglican faith despicable. He took it for granted that an educated man in modern times must have abandoned all belief in Christian dogmas and should therefore openly defy the Church and her obsolete activities. Nothing could be more un-English than Nietzsche's philosophy; such radicalism is suspect on this side of the Channel. England has never shown great readiness to throw old things overboard as useless ballast; a sound distrust of sweeping innovations and radical verdicts prevails. In the sixteenth century the Erasmian reformation which tried to blend and interfuse old and new ideas in order to avoid breach and disruption found its best response in England. The Erasmian attempt failed, but when the great Humanist died in 1536 he was a forgotten and vanquished man on the Continent overshadowed and pushed aside by the impetus and violence of Luther, his followers and adversaries as well. In England, however, Erasmus' ideal was still widely adhered to though all the odds were against it. There is therefore an important difference between the English and the German situation—industrialisation was more vehement and thorough in England but there was less disintegration of the traditional national life because the conservative temperament which holds on to old standards and values in a stubborn and irrational manner was much stronger than in Germany.

ERICH MEISSNER, *Germany in Peril.*

John Keble, looking at the portraits of eighteenth-century bishops in an Oxford college hall, is said to have remarked on the strange choice of persons made by Divine Providence as channels for the transmission of the Apostolic Succession. Group photographs of cabinet ministers or prominent leaders of the Opposition during the last twenty years have often reminded me of his remark.

E. L. WOODWARD, *Short Journey.*

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS

KIERKEGAARD: A NOTE.

EVEN among us insular English, Kierkegaard has at last become (theologically speaking) fashionable. There is something like a spate of translations of his religious and philosophical writings, papers on his "message" are popular at clerical fraternals, his biography (full length) has been written, and very well written, by an American doctor of divinity, and it is not impossible that we shall presently have a complete English edition of Kierkegaard's works—a formidable undertaking even though he died at the age of forty-one (1854). When a long neglected writer reaches this position of eminence he obtains, of course, a following immensely larger than in the days of his obscurity, but also a following that is much less discerning and devoted. If we read him and discuss him today it is not necessarily because we are disciples and lovers, but because it is now the thing to do.

Indeed the reader may propose to himself this test: Suppose (let him say) I had never before heard of Kierkegaard but had picked up a copy of, say, his *Edifying Discourses:* should I have said after reading it, "Here is a writer I must know; I must read everything this man has written"? To be honest, some of us would have to answer, No: for the truth is that it is possible to read very much of Kierkegaard without kindling to him. Nor does acquaintance with his personality as revealed in his *Journal,* and indeed in all his writings, greatly help. He was not likeable. No doubt he was a good coffee-house companion, a brilliant talker (in monologue), and, superficially, for he affected the disguise, something of a wit and a wag; but he was not likeable. His was a twisted, tortured nature at odds with society and governed overmuch by its own antipathies. Even his invincible confidence in his own significance for generations to come fails to captivate us, as it failed to sweeten his own bitterness. But this confidence is certainly impressive. His writings, as we know, found little appreciation during his life-time, and he belonged to that large and unhappy fraternity of authors who are driven to publish at their own expense; nevertheless he was persuaded that the time would come when his neglected books would be sought after and translated into many languages and when even the smallest details of his life would be, as he expressed it, studied and studied. Such presentiments are, it is true, not uncommon among neglected authors; what is uncommon and impressive in Kierkegaard's case is that they were true.

It may be that we shall not begin to appreciate Kierkegaard's significance until we reflect upon the fact that he lived and wrote at a time when the philosophy of Hegel was spreading through Europe like a fever—and some of us are old enough to remember its final phase. What then did Hegelianism mean for the average man, the average intelligent Christian man? It meant that somehow everything was part of a wonderful unity; God, Man, the State, the World—all were One. Of course there were distinctions, even contrasts and contradictions; there was good and there was evil, there was beauty and there was ugliness; but these contrasts and collisions were only a part of the necessary process by which the marvellous Oneness should be enriched and fulfilled. For *au fond* everything was divine. Man was divine, the State was divine; God, the Absolute, was realizing Himself through the universal World Soul and working out a

divine experience in which all things should be gathered up into that glorious Unity—that Synthesis of which all antitheses were only Itself in the making. The Absolute was being mediated to the Individual through the Universal, and in the end God would be All in all.

We can see how attractive this must have been to hard-pressed Christian apologists assailed by the flank movements and frontal attacks of the new learning, historical and textual criticism, scientific agnosticism, pantheistic humanism and much else. Here was a captivating philosophy which promised to rehabilitate the Christian World-view: for how well the universalism of *Colossians* and *Ephesians*, of *Rom.* 8 and *1 Cor.* 15 lent themselves, as it seemed, to Hegelian reinterpretation! St. Paul's prestige, thanks to Hegel, was by way of being re-established in the modern world: it was as if he had received a new diploma in Divinity from the University of Berlin.

But the Hegelian interpretation did not leave the Christian Faith as it found it. After all, if a man is a particle of a totality that is divine, what he needs is not redemption but an awareness of his integration in the Whole. If he should feel himself a sinner shut away from God it would not be a mediator that he needed, but a technique of recollection by which he would remind himself that he was essentially a part of God and that any feeling to the contrary was illusory. For why should moral evil be taken so very seriously in a universe that was essentially divine? Sin was only a part of the dialectical process—at worst a lovers' quarrel, sure to be made up. In such ways as these Hegelianism, insofar as it succeeded in Hegelianizing the Faith, transformed it into a more or less mystical and unethical pantheism.

The first significance of Kierkegaard is that he said No to all this. He bestrode the path and challenged Hegelianism, not so much in the name of Christianity as in the name of Individual Man. God, for Kierkegaard, was not the All, the Totality of all being, but the qualitatively and eternally Other; the *Zeitgeist* was by no means the Holy Ghost; the Absolute was not mediated through the Universal to the individual, but instead the Individual stood before the Absolute in awful immediacy of contact. In the parable the publican prays, "God be merciful to me, the sinner". If he had had the advantage of an Hegelian education he might, like the Pharisee, have prayed "with himself", and addressed the Almighty in terms perhaps of mutual gratulation. Kierkegaard went back to the publican's original categories, "God—me", "God—me, the sinner".

Let us consider this a little more in detail. In his *Philosophical Fragments* (1843) Kierkegaard raises the question, How far does the Truth admit of being learned? And first he examines the Socratic answer. According to Socrates, the soul had a previous existence. Its birth into this world was no more than a sleep and a forgetting; and what it needed in order to know the truth was to be awakened to the possession—the recollection—of that occult store of knowledge which it had garnered for itself before its present incarnation. What it needed was to have its memory jogged, for learning was simply recollection and the teacher no more than the remembrancer; he was, so to say, the midwife who helped to bring the learner's memory to birth. Thus the Socratic answer was, "Enquire within upon everything". Over against this Kierkegaard sets the Christian answer, or his own interpretation of it. In place of the doctrine that every man is in possession of the Truth he declares that every man, by reason of sin, is *dis*possessed of it. In place of the doctrine of Recollection, the acquisition of truth through the organ of memory, he presents the doctrine of Revelation through a new organ, faith. In place of the doctrine of man's independence—that is, man's possession of inward, occult resources

of his own—he declares man to be absolutely dependent upon God the Revealer; and in place of the notion of a relatively unimportant, incidental moment of reminiscence, or a series of such moments, he sets the Eternal Moment of faith.

But Kierkegaard has more than this to say. Man's sinfulness, he points out, means not simply that he is dispossessed of Truth, it means that he is estranged from it, at enmity with it; it means that his ignorance is not passive but polemical. So that what man needs is not only Truth in the form of revelation; he needs also the *condition* in which he may receive it; Revelation implies Regeneration.

But how can this condition be created? How can God, Who is wholly other than man, so work in and upon man as to impart the new condition and yet do so without annihilating man as a free person? That God should not reveal Himself would mean the death of love; that He should reveal Himself might mean the death of man. The dilemma, says Kierkegaard, is met by miracle: God becomes Man.

Here we have another Kierkegaardian characteristic—the Paradox. That God should become Man, the Infinite become finite, is a contradiction in terms. But that is the nature of Paradox. And somehow, says Kierkegaard, reason demands the paradoxical; it is love-sick for that which it cannot embrace without dissolution; its supreme passion is for that which, in the nature of things, it can never comprehend—for Truth, the whole Truth, whose comprehension would mean for human reason annihilation: just as the passion of the mathematician goes out to the mathematically incalculable. The region of Paradox is the region of this high romance, this supreme passion, and it is here that Truth keeps her tryst. To say that a man raises himself by humbling himself, that he finds life by losing it, is to affirm a contradiction, but it is also to affirm something that is most deeply true. And what if it is so with the paradox God-Man? A paradox is not refuted when it is declared to be self-contradictory; it is simply shown to be itself: and the incomprehensible is not denied but affirmed when it is shown that it cannot be comprehended. "Take away the Paradox from a thinker and you have—a Professor". When do Reason and Paradox, then, meet and embrace? Kierkegaard answers, In the Eternal Moment of Faith. Faith is the *nexus;* and Faith is not knowledge, not volition; it is—Faith; and it is *given.*

In all this Kierkegaard argues not as an apostle nor yet as a Christian believer, but as a man of genius, as an individual under the pressure of an individual, personal necessity to come to terms with life, under the pressure of a deep, tragical sense of individual man's *aloneness* and of his being "always in the wrong with God". Face this, says Kierkegaard, in effect. Do not think you can so democratize or Hegelianize yourself as to lose yourself in the crowd, dissolve yourself into the All, and escape your individual burden by ceasing to be an individual. Cross the frontiers of your dreamland, your fools' paradise, into the land of stern reality. You are you, a man and a sinner, in the wrong with God. Be it so. Acknowledge it. This is the first step toward peace. It is at least a step into *sanity.*

It is this concept of Dread, of the individual, sinful man standing in the presence of the holy God, which governs the intense subjectivism of Kierkegaard's thought and distinguishes it from, say, the subjectivism of Schleiermacher. In his celebrated *Addresses on Religion* Schleiermacher has a passage descriptive of the soul's initiating experience of the Infinite (the Infinite, the Universal, the All, or the Infinite World equating here with God):

> It is bashful and tender as a maiden's kiss, it is holy and fruitful as a bridal embrace. Nor is it merely like, it is all this. It is the first contact of the universal life with an individual. . . . You lie directly on the bosom of the infinite world. In that moment you are its soul. Through one part of your nature you feel, as your own, all its powers and its endless life. In that moment it is your body.

Against this set a passage from one of Kierkegaard's *Edifying Discourses* and note the different accent:

> Without is the uproar of the multitude; one man making himself heard as leader, the majority noisy because they are themselves the crowd. But He Who knows all . . . wants not the crowd . . . only with the individual will He have any dealings. . . . One may find it more comfortable, as it is more cowardly, thus to hide in the crowd in the hope that God cannot tell one man from another. But in eternity every man shall render his account as an individual. . . . And in eternity he shall have very special attention, this individual who supposed himself lost in the crowd.

The same theme is expounded in what, so far as its title is concerned, was surely the oddest of his pseudonymous tracts, *Recollections of My Life, by Nebuchadnezzar, Sometime Emperor, Recently Ox*. The title suggests a burlesque, but the treatment is tremendous in its seriousness. The proud Emperor finds himself suddenly "as a beast and no man" in the presence of the God of heaven, and it is when, in that dread presence, Nebuchadnezzar recognizes his own guilt, his own shame, that the night of his degradation and despair gives place to morning. "In the end of the days I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes unto heaven and mine understanding returned to me"—but only then, only with confession and self-condemnation. This for Kierkegaard is the eternal dialectic of holiness and guilt.

It is in this context that his conception of Faith is framed—in the context of Dread. In his *Fear and Trembling* (1843) he takes as the classic example of faith Abraham's offering up of Isaac on Mount Moriah. This, he argues, is not an example of renunciation (for in the deepest sense Abraham surrendered nothing), nor yet of heroism; it is precisely an example of *Faith*, the faith that dares in God's name to believe the absurd, the Paradox, and this to the limit of a suspension of relative ethics. To read this terrible little book is to feel oneself shut in a room with a mad swordsman. Finally, we have Faith in its double relation to the Historical and the Eternal. In the Christian Paradox of the God-Man, the Eternal and the Historical are brought together; eternity irrupts into time, and the point of contact is the Jesus Christ of history. Nevertheless there was never, even for the first believers, any immediacy of contact with the Absolute *through the senses*. Even in the presence of the historical Jesus Christ, faith was always faith: for it is never in flesh and blood to discern what is outside its own dimension and calculus. To discern the Absolute in Jesus meant, in the days of His flesh no less than now, the Eternal Moment and the gift of Faith.

Here we must end our note. We have observed enough to recognize the importance of Kierkegaard's influence in the theology of Barth, Brunner, and others, enough also to recognize something of its own limitations. For Kierkegaard's individualism seems almost absolute; he had little or no sense of Humanity, of Society. He lived in the romantic period of the democratic revolution, before the honeymoon of nineteenth century democracy was well over, but he seems to have hated it. Withal, his individualism,

Christianized though it was, was not without a certain Titanism. Faith as he describes it impresses us as being not only a miracle but a "prodigy", and the Believer looms up ambiguous and monstrous in an Ossianesque atmosphere of mystery. The Christian Faith, as we understand it, presupposes that man, whatever his lost estate, is capable of recognizing the Good *as* the Good; so that the Christian worship of God is not a blind surrender to power and glory and a goodness that is unknowable, but a surrender to the Good *recognized as such*. With Kierkegaard there are times when it appears to be a prostration of soul before the wholly Other Who is, indeed, the Good, but Whose goodness is so incomprehensible that man must blindly submit to it as to Absolute Authority. Nevertheless Kierkegaard's witness shines as a warning light and rings out like an iron bell struck by an iron hammer—his witness, namely, against those perilous shoals of error that lie concealed beneath the mystical pietism or philosophic monism which would annul the difference between God and man, between the Creator and His creatures.

GWILYM O. GRIFFITH.

Kierkegaard's Concluding Unscientific Postscript. Translated by DAVID SWENSON, with introduction and notes by WALTER LOWRIE. Oxford Press. 36s.

This is the longest and perhaps the most important of the translations which we owe to the energy and enthusiasm of Dr. Lowrie. The original appeared in 1846, the year of Dostoievski's first novel, and is one of the important books of the 19th century. Its author called it the turning point of his work, presenting "the problem of his career as a writer", that of "becoming a Christian". It cruises round the whole question of what Christianity means, what relationship to God it implies, what faith is, and how all these vital things have become buried beneath the ethical indifference of the modern scientific attitude. Readers should not be scared away by first impressions of the length and difficulty of the book. It is difficult, but fascinating, to follow an argument so rich in homely illustration and pungent asides, in revealing aphorisms and stinging phrases which, even in translation, stab the point home more effectively than argument.

> In an age when the progress of culture and the like has made it seem so easy to be a Christian, it is quite in order to seek to make it difficult, provided one does not make it more difficult than it is. I forget the age in which we live, the theocratic 19th century, in which we all contemplate the world process, from the divine standpoint.

Thus ironically does Kierkegaard phrase his main thesis, untimely a hundred years ago, most topical today, that ideas on religion and ethics are relevant only if they take account of the fact that we are not external spectators of life (that would be, strictly, a "divine standpoint") but active participators in it. We do not, and cannot, see it in the whole, we live it in the particular. Christianity is proved true in "existence", that is, by daring to live it; it is killed by external contemplation and reflection:

> My principal thought was that in our age, because of the great increase in knowledge, we had forgotten what it means to exist, and what inwardness signifies . . . if men had forgotten what it means to exist religiously, they had doubtless also forgotten what it means to exist as human beings; this must therefore be set forth.

Hence the recurring attack on Hegel and his "system" and the constant championing of the Socratic method:

> Socrates' infinite merit is to have been an *existing* thinker, not a speculative philosopher who forgets what it means to exist. . . . Old Master Socrates did just the opposite (to our clergymen and speculative philosophers), choosing the higher and more difficult task of understanding himself before God.

For those who will ponder these pages it is clear that Kierkegaard is one of the forces behind the contemporary rehabilitation of theology, as he is also behind the confusion between values and the subject and behind the tendencies that make the individual a criterion of truth and conduct. It would be rash to judge how far he is responsible for these tendencies. The man who said "truth is subjectivity" was far indeed from the Nazi dismissal of objective values. The sense of the power and reality of God pervades his work. His words on faith will serve as testimony:

> Faith is precisely the contradiction between the infinite passion of the individual's inwardness and the objective uncertainty. If I am capable of grasping God objectively, I do not believe, but precisely because I cannot do this I must believe.

It is difficult to realize that such words were written 97 years ago.

W. G. MOORE.

A study of the writings of Nietzsche is a very necessary preliminary to understanding the origins and growth of the Nazi mentality in Germany, and there could be no better introduction to the subject than Prof. F. Copleston's *Friedrich Nietzsche, Philosopher of Culture* (Burns, Oates, 8s. 6d.). The author is a very learned Jesuit Father, and has a natural bias in favour of Roman Catholic Christianity. But, though he never conceals his own convictions, he writes always with the utmost fairness and restraint, and with a quite admirable objectivity. The result is a picture of the many-sided madness of Nietzsche, in which good and evil are strangely intermingled, and full justice is done to both.

The book opens with a very interesting sketch of Nietzsche's life and then plunges at once into a discussion of culture and of the peculiar brand of culture which Nietzsche made his philosophy of life. This is something very different from typical German *Kultur*, on the one hand, or Matthew Arnold's "Sweetness and light", on the other. Indeed, it is more French than German and involves such wide knowledge, good taste, and capacity for artistic emotion as are only possible for supermen. Then follows a study of the Superman idea and the will to power, of Nietzsche's criticisms of morality and of Christianity, and of his attitude to Schopenhauer and to Jews. The book concludes with a summing up of the author's own criticism of Nietzsche and a defence of the Christian ideal of culture. The tragedy of Nietzsche's life is that he perverted to evil ends an "outstanding talent and earnestness, a naturally noble character, and a hatred of sham and pretence".

W. B. SELBIE.

NEW EDITIONS.

The Rev. C. T. Rae's *Contagious Christianity* is now in a 3rd Edition (Indep. Press, 2s. 6d.). *Club Leadership* (Oxford Press, 5s.) is the third edition of Mr. Basil L. Q. Henriques's practical handbook: it should be found specially useful just now. Mr. E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* is a new "Everyman" (Dent, 3s.).

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

Bernard Lord Manning. By F. BRITTAIN, M.A. Heffer. 7s. 6d.
A Layman in the Ministry. By BERNARD LORD MANNING. Independent Press. 6s.
The Hymns of Wesley and Watts. By BERNARD LORD MANNING. Epworth Press. 6s.

All Bernard Manning's friends will be grateful to Mr. Brittain, his colleague at Jesus, for this sympathetic and intimate memoir. It is written, of course, from the Cambridge angle, but that does not mean that Mr. Brittain fails to bring out Manning's love for his father and his father's churches, his devotion to Congregationalism and to "orthodox Dissent", and his appreciation of—nay his affection for—much in Methodism, Anglicanism, and even the Roman Church. It is well, too, that those who did not know Manning's work in Cambridge should learn the extent of his influence in his own College and in the University, and realize the strenuous life lived by this invalid who never talked of his disabilities.

Bernard Manning had many gifts; he had wide knowledge, clear judgment, and a great capacity for friendship; he was ever loyal to the things in which he believed, and he believed in them heart and soul; he was a fine scholar, and all he said and wrote was seasoned with salt. We could have wished that his dream might have been realized, and that he might have ended his life as minister of his father's old church in Ravenstonedale. We could have wished, too, that the denomination he served had had the opportunity to elect him to the Chair of the Union. He died at 48, all too soon it seems to us. But his influence will not die, and Mr. Brittain's work will reveal him to those who did not know him. Mention should be made of the excellent photographs.

The two posthumous volumes admirably illustrate two of Manning's main interests—the preaching of the Word and the hymns of the Church.

The Rev. H. C. Carter has made the selection of sermons, most of which were preached at Ravenstonedale, and to them are added addresses on special occasions, when, we think, Manning was at his best. Notable here are an address on "Effectual Preaching", delivered at the Annual Meeting of his father's old College, and "A Charge to the Church at Its Minister's Ordination", as effective when read as when it was delivered. Bernard Manning was *sui generis*, and it would be absurd to suggest that all Congregational lay preaching—or ministerial preaching, for that matter—approaches this high level; nevertheless Congregationalism was proud of its lay preacher *par excellence*, and these sermons should be a spur to all who are called to preach. Manning was very humble about his preaching; that was one of the reasons why he prepared so well. "Who is sufficient for these things?" was his attitude, and men less well equipped, intellectually and spiritually, could learn the lesson of thorough preparation, if no other, from this consecrated scholar.

Of hymns Manning loved to talk and write, and, it must be admitted, he loved equally to alarm his audience and poke fun at their prejudices. No Methodist we know knew the Methodist Hymnbook as he did, and his affection for *Barrett* was only equalled by his scorn for the *Hymnary*. As with preaching, he desired hymns to be worship, and nothing roused him more than pretty poems masquerading as hymns: his view of *Songs of Praise* was loudly proclaimed, and we cannot but wonder what has passed between him and Percy Dearmer.

The three volumes together made a fitting memorial. EDITOR.

John Ray, Naturalist. By CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D. Cambridge Press. 30s.

There are few greater pleasures than to read a book which is all that a book ought to be. Such is Dr. C. E. Raven's *John Ray:* the book is beautifully produced, it has a most useful Epitome and an adequate Index; its author is *en rapport* with his subject and has the knowledge to deal competently with it. For what more could one ask?

One need not be a naturalist to appreciate John Ray, though it is to be feared that Nonconformists have not appreciated one of their greatest sons. Ray was born in 1627, and had already taught Greek and Mathematics at Trinity College, Cambridge, when the Restoration came. He believed Charles II's promises and proceeded to Ordination, for he considered divinity his life work; but the Act of Uniformity was too much for him, and in 1662 he forfeited his Fellowship. Poverty did not come to him immediately as to many others of the ejected; from 1663 to 1672 he found a partner in Francis Willughby, with whom he lived and travelled, studying the works of God in nature. He married soon after Willughby's death, had four daughters, and a chronic, painful illness: how he contrived to collect material for his great works on plants, birds, fishes, and insects, constantly handicapped by poverty as well as illness, is one of the mysteries of history. Time and again preferment was offered, but he remained faithful to his convictions. In Dr. Raven's words, which his volume fully justifies:

> His greatness is that in a time of tradition and universal turmoil he saw the need for precise and ordered knowledge, set himself to test the old and explore the new, and by dint of immense labour in the field and in the study laid the foundations of modern science in many branches of zoology and botany. He studied, corrected and collated the existing literature; he collected, identified, investigated, described and classified mammals, birds, reptiles, fishes and insects, cryptogams and all known plants; he contributed richly to the advance of geology and made observations in astronomy and physics; he was a pioneer in the study of languages and first revealed the importance of dialect and folk-speech; he did as much as any man of his time to develop a new understanding and interpretation of religion; more perhaps than any man he enabled the transition from the medieval to the modern outlook. That he could do so is due not only to his own genius and opportunies, but to the character of his inheritance and the circumstances of his upbringing. EDITOR.

The Fear of Freedom. By ERICH FROMM. Kegan Paul. 15s.
Reflections on Government. By ERNEST BARKER. Oxford Press. 21s.

Here are two very important books for the times, the first by a writer hitherto unknown to us, the second by one to whom our debt has steadily

mounted since we read his *Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle* thirty-five years ago.

Dr. Fromm's volume appears in the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction edited by Dr. Karl Mannheim. It is one of the few books we have met applying psychology to the study of society which does not irritate or amuse by becoming extravagant or fantastic. Man, says Dr. Fromm, in medieval days was part of a feudal society; he became free from its bonds, but this left him isolated and deprived of the security he had enjoyed, and the sense of belonging. He became conscious of his personal insignificance, and

> Protestantism was the answer to the human needs of the frightened, uprooted, and isolated individual who had to orient and to relate himself to a new world. The new character structure, resulting from economic and social changes and intensified by religious doctrines, became in turn an important factor in shaping the further social and economic development.

Dr. Fromm works out his theory very persuasively, though he will not always carry his readers; what does he mean, *e.g.*, by saying that Luther and Calvin "belong to the ranks of the greatest haters among the leading figures of history, certainly among religious leaders"? We fight for freedom of speech, but to speak what, for freedom of worship, but to worship what? When we have our freedom, have we anything worth while to say, or any God to worship? We secured "freedom from", but there remains "freedom to ——?" In his more psychological chapters Dr. Fromm effectively uses Dostoevski's character, who has

> no more pressing need than the one to find somebody to whom he can surrender, as quickly as possible, that gift of freedom which he, the unfortunate creature, was born with.

From authoritarianism and conformity, sadism and masochism ("mechanics of escape") we pass to the psychology of Nazism, and then to an admirable concluding chapter, "Freedom and Democracy", in which Dr. Fromm answers the question whether the fear resulting from freedom must inevitably lead to new bondage in the words, "positive freedom consists in the spontaneous activity of the total, integrated personality". The Christian, certainly the Congregational, answer is that the isolated individual finds freedom and fulfilment in fellowship.

Dr. Barker's volume is one not only to read, but to keep for constant reference. Though a book of 420 pages, it is so condensed that summary is difficult. Its four parts are: Democratic Government and Its Internal Difficulties; Democracy and Its External Difficulties; Amendments to Democracy; Alternatives to Democracy. All who know Dr. Barker's work will need no assurance that in handling these themes he brings sound wisdom to bear on the great problem of our time—the relation of man to society. The arguments for and against proportional representation have never been more cogently stated, the nature and limits of a planned economy never more lucidly examined. Against a vast background of historical knowledge, and in a tolerant and liberal spirit, Dr. Barker surveys democracy and its competitors. Two quotations may be offered as specimens of his attitude and style:

> Organizations always tend to be regarded, especially by their organizers, as ends in themselves. No organization is ever that. Any organization is a means to the freedom of its members. But no organization is absolutely justified even if it promotes the freedom of

all its members—but promotes *their* freedom only. It may do that, and yet be inimical to a broader freedom.

The essence of the political mode of action, in the democratic State, is that each man counts as a person, and not as an instrument: that each, as a person or living spirit, advances claims of right, and makes acknowledgments of duty, in the spiritual field of personal relations; and that an adjustment is attained in this field which is self-adjustment, and, as such, consistent with personal autonomy.

If readers are looking for books for Christmas presents for their ministers they need not go beyond these two. EDITOR.

Archæology and the Religion of Israel. By W. F. ALBRIGHT. Johns Hopkins & Oxford University Presses. 10s. 6d.

Two years ago Professor Albright published his masterly work *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. He has now supplemented this in these Ayer Lectures. These are in no sense a rehash of the earlier work, though they deal with the same field. The author estimates that at least ninety per cent of the material of this book is not in the previous work. It may be commended unreservedly as a work marked by the same high quality as its predecessor, based on wide and authoritative knowledge, and penetrated by real discernment and sound judgment.

Prof. Albright is an archæologist of distinction, but he is much more than that. Both of these works show an amazing range of erudition, and their author seems to be acquainted with everything that is in any way related to his theme, whether in the field of criticism, psychology, the philosophy of history, or comparative religion. The five chapters deal with the light shed by archæology on the ancient Near-Eastern mind, the background of *O.T.* religion, Canaanite religion, and the religion of Israel in the earlier and the later periods.

The reader will find here a first-class survey of the archæological material, with rich documentation in the notes, which are gathered at the end of the volume. The Ras Shamra evidence is handled with particular care. Prof. Albright has dealt at first hand with the texts in a series of studies, whose fruits are constantly evident. In common with a number of other scholars who have worked on these texts, he rejects certain theories of Dussaud and Virolleaud, which have been popularized in some English works, and especially the "Negebite" theory that traces the Ras Shamra community to the south Palestinian district in which Israel is said to have spent a large part of the period of the Wandering. Of great value, too, is his discussion of the significance of the ornamentation of Solomon's Temple.

On some detailed points criticism may be offered. On p. 103 Prof. Albright accepts the statement of *Joshua* that the Tabernacle was set up at Shiloh, whose destruction by the Philistines the Danish excavations may now be regarded as having settled. On the following page he affirms that the Tabernacle was thereafter moved to Nob, and eventually to Kirjath-jearim, where the Ark had meanwhile been reposing (p. 120). For this assumed history of the Tabernacle no evidence is offered. We are not told how the Tabernacle managed to survive the Philistine destruction, or why, once it was separated from the Ark at Nob, it was restored to it at Kirjath-jearim.

Prof. Albright follows the view of Noth that after the Conquest the twelve Israelite tribes formed an amphictyony round a central shrine, and identifies that shrine with Shiloh. On Albright's view the Israelite tribes

did not all enter the land together, the Joseph tribes having entered about a century and a half before the tribes Joshua led, of which Judah was the chief. I know of no evidence to associate the tribe of Judah with Shiloh, except in narratives of *Joshua* that were designed to represent the entry of all the tribes as simultaneous. It would seem questionable to rely for evidence of the unity or amphictyony of the twelve tribes in that age on a document whose evidence that that unity rested on a common entry is rejected.

Criticism of such detailed points is not intended to detract from the solid merits of this study. For this work is much more than a well-documented repository of facts. It is an attempt to assess the significance of the facts, and to trace the process of Israel's religious development in the light of them. Prof. Albright is not of the school that resolves Israel's achievement into a reflection of that of any other people. He places Israel in the setting of her ancient environment in order to bring out her difference from her contemporaries, as well as her cultural and religious relations with them. His general point of view he describes as a "rational conservatism". This means that while his conclusions are in some respects conservative, his method is fully scientific, and his conclusions are the positions he reaches, not those he sets out to defend. To the reviewer it seems that the ascription of full monotheism to Moses is scarcely warranted by the evidence, and not required by the subsequent development as Prof. Albright traces it. But again to say this is not to temper appreciation of the wise and sound guidance this book gives. No subsequent writer on *O.T.* religion can afford to neglect this book and its companion, and the general reader who would understand the *O.T.* more fully in the setting of its cultural and religious background can find no more up-to-date, reliable, and balanced help.

H. H. Rowley.

The Old Testament in the World Church. By Godfrey E. Phillips. Lutterworth Press. 10s.

Professor Phillips has here given us a valuable book of a distinctive character. On the basis of his own missionary work, and of his official and personal contacts with many missionaries, he has studied the problem created for the Church in all lands by the presence of the *O.T.* as part of its sacred literature. The problem is real, for the Church has never quite known what to do with the *O.T.* It cannot be treated as on the same level as the *N.T.*, yet to study it in true historical perspective makes an intellectual demand beyond the reach of many. The older ways of dogmatic or allegorical interpretation are now largely (and rightly) discredited.

The method of treatment is clear and practical. In the first of the four parts there is a review of the actual use of the *O.T.* on the mission-fields of Africa, India, and China, bringing out some of the difficulties encountered by missionaries, such as the claim that the Indian classics ought to replace the *O.T.* as a preparation for the *N.T.* In the second part there is a brief study of the *O.T.* itself in the light of missionary experience and interests. Some of the parallels with other religions are noticed, the general point of view being that the *O.T.* shows what God did in a particular period in S.W. Asia. But the unique features of the *O.T.* are also emphasized. In the third part we have a review, necessarily brief, of the place taken by the *O.T.* in the Church during past centuries. This begins with its influence on Jesus Himself and comes down to the present need to bring out the unity of the Bible as against excessive historicism. In the fourth part some practical conclusions are drawn. It is rightly argued that the *O.T.* will

always remain necessary for the proper understanding of the *N.T.*, as well as because its apparently sterner teaching is often ignored:

> In all lands the attempt to follow Jesus as perceived through the New Testament alone has been marred by sentimentalism and weakness.

In different regions the *O.T.* can render differing services, as in making contact with the primitive thought of Africa, and in challenging on the one hand the pantheism of India and on the other the humanism of China. We need the whole *O.T.*, though the anthologies have a transitional value. Islam presents special difficulties for the Christian faith, but here the *O.T.* is the obvious point of common departure.

It is clear that such a book, in which the treatment of the *O.T.* is critical and competent, can be very useful, not only to missionaries but also to teachers generally, since children are often at the same stage of thinking as are native converts. General readers also will find the book full of interesting material, and it is well written.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Jesus in the Light of History. By A. T. Olmstead. Scribners. 10s. 6d.

Jesus in the Light of History—that is a formidable title. It suggests yet another attempt at the impossible. We remember the innumerable "Lives of Jesus" which claimed to present the "Jesus of History". Many of them showed clearly their authors and their interests, but which of them presents the "Jesus of History"? The records of our Lord's life are too brief to be used as the materials of a biography. And even if a historian should succeed, where all have failed, he would still only have enabled us to be one of the contemporaries of Jesus, and none of His contemporaries could understand Him. Like Kierkegaard, we fear that had we been among them, we too might have shared in their "terrible blunder".

Yet if it is impossible to describe the "Jesus of History", it is possible to elucidate the external circumstances of His life by reference to the beliefs and circumstances of His age. How much, for instance, many of us, before we had access to Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar*, owed to the Jewish background given in Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

Professor Olmstead knows the topography of Palestine as if it were his own home town. As he tells us, he has "tramped the country until no spot Jesus once trod has escaped" his notice. He has talked with the villagers in their own language, and, in consequence, he writes of the sacred sites with the clarity which comes from precise and familiar knowledge.

The most startling feature of this "Life" lies in its investigation of the chronology. Dr. Olmstead is Prof. of Assyriology at Chicago University, and behind his book lies not only his own immense learning but that of many of his colleagues and associates in the Oriental Institute of that University. Using the researches of two of his students on Babylonian Chronology, he shows that of the possible years of the crucifixion, the only year on which Nisan 14 fell on a Friday was A.D. 30. In this way he proves that the crucifixion took place on April 7th, A.D. 30:

> This conclusion is furthermore corroborated in the most extraordinary manner; more than two centuries ago, great scholars calculated the Easter Cycle, by which the date of our Easter is to this day fixed. To fill up the blank spaces in their tables, they calculated the Easter Cycle back to the beginning of the Christian Era. In these ancient tables, we may still read their date of Easter Sunday for the year 30 A.D. and it is April 9!

Again, the passage read by Jesus before His Nazareth Sermon is assigned to the 62nd Seder, and this "62nd Seder was read on December 18, 28 A.D.". Thus "we can even give the exact length of Jesus' ministry—475 days".

Since Herod the Great died in "B.C. 4" Jesus must thus have been more than 30 years old when He was crucified. Prof. Olmstead, like Irenaeus, whom he does not mention, supposes from the reference in *John* 8^{57} that Jesus was nearly fifty when he began His ministry, so that he assigns His birth to about 20 B.C. But this date is a matter of conjecture, not of proof. To the reviewer Luke's statement that Jesus was "about thirty" seems the more trustworthy tradition.

We find it impossible to believe that "the pitiful lament of the Psalmist": *Eloi Eloi lama sabachthani*, was due to the desire of "an early biographer" "to heighten the dramatic effect" by providing "the desired human touch". When Jesus was preached as the risen Lord, such words, which opponents of the Gospel would call words of weakness, would not have been invented. But if we cannot agree with all the features of Prof. Olmstead's portrait of Jesus, we greatly prize the full and precise detail of its background. For all its immense learning it is written in simple, concise English. This is a book which *N.T.* scholars will have to study, and which "general readers" will be able to appreciate. We hope that this rich product of American scholarship will be very widely read in this country.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Book of Revelation is History. By H. S. BELLAMY. Faber. 8s. 6d.

Mr. Bellamy is the author of an earlier book, *Moons, Myths and Man*, in which he adopts the astronomical theory of the Austrian scientist Hans Hoerbiger that at the end of the Tertiary Age a pre-lunar satellite approached the earth and disintegrated under the stress of gravitation with appalling results to our planet. Then, perhaps some 13,000 years ago, an outer planet Luna "clicked" as it were with Earth and became its satellite, an event which also gave us a bad shaking and involved the loss of "Atlantis".

In the present book Mr. Bellamy seeks to show that the memory of these terrestrial catastrophes is perpetuated in the bulk of the Johannine Apocalypse. Dismissing any theory of *O.T.* influence and even "comparative" mythology, he follows "modern explanatory" mythology especially as based on Hoerbiger's cosmological theory, of which he gives an interesting sketch. At the time of the first disaster there was developed human life on the earth and a remnant managed to survive. It treasured its recollections in reports which we call "cosmological myths", and these became enshrined in secret and sacred books. "John", redactor rather than author, mythologist more than theologian, whether from association with an esoteric circle in Patmos or some other group of intelligentsia, came upon this record of terrestrial cataclysms (written in some primitive Semitic tongue), and supplied it with an Introduction (the 7 letters), sundry interpolations, and a patchwork ending, all of a religious character.

Mr. Bellamy's concern is wholly with the cosmological and mythological elements. He finds no fewer than 27 individual myths, 26 of which (falling into three cycles) deal with the earlier cataclysm, while the 27th describes the conjunction of the Earth with Luna, and the attendant woes (the Babylon of *Rev.* 17f is Atlantis!). He deals with each of these in detail, and we may note in passing a novel, not to say fantastic, interpretation of the famous "number of the beast". He does not claim to have wrenched the

full secret "out of the clutches of the apocalyptic sphinx", though he hopes he has given a new flavour to the study of the book. Perhaps that is why his work is "recommended by the Book Society". I prefer Dr. E. F. Scott's treatment (S.C.M., 1939).

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Physics and Philosophy. By Sir JAMES JEANS. Cambridge Press. 8s. 6d.

It is impossible in a brief notice to do justice to this book with its brilliant exposition of the results of modern physics, its masterly reviews of the history of physics in the past, its interesting surveys of past and present philosophies, and its suggestive discussion of the questions on which physics and philosophy converge. But the following summary of the main drift may give some preliminary idea of what the author intends. Starting from the position that the only adequate statement of present-day physics must be mathematical, he recognizes that such a statement is too abstract for most people, and requires to be supplemented by some pictorial representation or other which may appeal to the imagination. Here we come upon the two complementary pictures of nature known as the particle-picture and as the wave-picture respectively. On the one hand, nature is represented as particles: these may be material, as electrons; or immaterial, as photons or light-quanta. On the other hand, nature is represented as waves: both matter and radiation can be represented in this way. The two representations, while complementary, are strictly alternative: one must be used in some circumstances, the other in different circumstances.

This is as far as science takes us: the question for philosophy is whether either or both of these representations gives us any clue to reality. Sir James Jeans says that the particle-picture is nearer to the phenomena of every-day life, while the wave-picture refers to a substratum underlying the phenomena: this picture of the substratum is a purely mental construction. A further very important point is that the wave-picture is closer to the proper mathematical statement of physics, with which it fundamentally agrees: it always gives correct results, whereas the particle-picture does not.

The philosophical effect is as follows. The particle-picture favours materialism together with indeterminism, since the motions of the particles have to be conceived as uncaused and free: it is only statistically that they obey the causal law, just as acts of human freedom may still result in obedience to statistical laws, when they are taken in the aggregate. The wave-picture, however, is entirely determined by the principle of causality, and thus favours determinism as a philosophical doctrine; while since it is a pure mental construction, it favours idealism and not materialism. Sir James Jeans, nevertheless, declines to dogmatize. Everything is in the melting-pot. But his comparison between the results of physics and different philosophical positions leads him to say a good word for Hegel, who was both an idealist and a determinist. Most of all he appears to admire the system of Alexander, who makes all things originate by a necessary development out of space-time.

R. S. FRANKS.

Managerial Revolution. By JAMES BURNHAM. Putnam. 7s. 6d.

This book has had an excellent press in America, where it was published in 1941. The author, a member of the Department of Philosophy of New York University, maintains that the really outstanding event of today is not the world war, but the tremendous social revolution of which the war is a symptom. Both autocracy and democracy are being challenged by the

rise of an entirely new power in the life of men and nations. Man's capacity for organization has called into being the super-man, and the future of mankind for many generations is entirely under his power and direction. This super-man is the modern highly-trained managerial type of man. He is the alert, efficient executive officer who directs and controls in an increasing measure our social and business world. With uncanny, but sure and certain, touch he controls the vast and complicated machine which has been built up during the last century by the expert organizer, the scientist, the inventor, the mathematician, and the engineer. The last and final word in the organization of the life of the community is with the manager and not with the politician.

Mr. Burnham develops this theme with great skill and force. His chapter on the growth of the managerial class in Russia reveals the revolution in that country from an entirely new angle. The despotism of the Tsars was replaced for a brief period only by a system of government which was almost pure socialism. Since then, we are told, "in every decisive respect, every year since then has found it further away, not nearer socialism as defined by their fathers".

> Today, Russia is the nation which has, in structural aspects, advanced furthest along the managerial road.
>
> The Russian revolution was a managerial revolution.
>
> Who are the rulers of Russia? They are the men who are running its factories, mines and railroads, the heads of the large collective farms, the expert manipulators of the propaganda mediums, the managers in short; these and their bureaucratic and military and police associates. The power and privilege are under their control. It is they who have curbed the masses and have instituted a social structure in which they are on top, through this monopoly control of a state power which has fused with economy.

Mr. Burnham traces the growth of the Managerial Society in Germany and in the U.S.A., and reaches the conclusion that of the three theories about the future—that capitalism will change into socialism, that capitalism will continue, that capitalism will change into managerial society—the last one is the most probable. He says:

> The managers are the only social group among almost all of whose members we find an attitude of self-confidence.

But is this true? Is there not a growing conviction amongst this very class that the pure, unadulterated materialism which Mr. Burnham takes for granted throughout his book is inevitably leading the world to frustration and despair? "If there is no greater purpose in life beyond the cold calculating purpose of the skilled manager, then may not Hitler be right?" This is the challenge which Sir Stafford Cripps has thrown to the world (but slightly amended to meet this problem).

It is not true that

> religious statements such as "God created the world" are not empirically significant, because it doesn't make any observable difference whether or not they are true.

It makes all the difference in the world. It is a man's belief in the ultimate purpose of his actions which gives them colour and quality, and it is only when that purpose is seen to be part of the Divine Plan that managerial functions can achieve their noblest ends.

The Managerial Society as outlined by our author is not the last word.

P. M. Robinson.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

While these pages were passing through the press we have had the privilege of reading the proofs of the Congregational Union's Lenten Book for 1943. It has been written by the Rev. Leslie E. Cooke, of Coventry, and it is wonderfully good. Mr. Cooke has wisely chosen for his subject "The Holy Spirit" and for his title **The Token of Our Inheritance* (Indep. Press, probably 4s.). There is nothing about which Christians generally are more vague than the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which is all the more strange when we consider that the gift of the Spirit was central to the teaching of Jesus and its possession the *sine qua non* of a consecrated life. With freshness of treatment, aptness of illustration, and felicity of phrase Mr. Cooke makes a real contribution to the subject. Ministers will find the book useful, and they would do well not only to read it themselves, but to commend it to their congregations.

All that Dr. H. H. Farmer writes is well worth reading, and *Towards Belief in God* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.) is no exception: all who work through it will undoubtedly profit. We cannot but regret, however, that the author has not given his work a form that would have had a wider appeal; it is written for those deeply interested in the subject and prepared to think seriously about it but are not technical students of theology or philosophy. Knowing how many elders and deacons consider our own pages "too high-brow", we fear that it is only these students who will persist with the book; the Christian layman, on reading "We now turn to the element of pragmatic verification in religious conviction", will at once say, "This is not for me", even as the student will suspect that "A may occasion B without being its sole and sufficient cause" comes from the class-room. It is not that Dr. Farmer cannot write simply: the passage about Captain Oates and the paragraph about his children are proof to the contrary; and we believe it would have been possible for him to help thousands where this book will touch hundreds.

We should like to see Dr. Farmer begin with the average Christian's data: a world where there is law, order, and beauty; men capable of courage, loyalty, sacrifice; Jesus, living, dying, rising from the dead—and showing how far God is demonstrable from these facts. Tornados and parasites, cancer and cruelty, Wigan and Stoke—the reverse side of the data—would afford openings to discuss the eternal problems affecting belief in God, and from the ordinary man's experience. Such a book is greatly needed.

If some modern were able to project himself back into the time of Hereward the Wake, and from his knowledge declare the shape of things to come and the truth he knew, how would he be received? From this unusual angle Mr. John S. Hoyland writes *The Christ of the Future* (Heffer, 1s.) to illustrate the mission and the method of Jesus.

The Dean of Wells's *Christian Belief* (S.P.C.K., 3s.) is a remarkably good short exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Dr. Malden says it is the kind of teaching he has given to school-children and Confirmation candidates, but surely it is much too advanced for this purpose. Sentences such as the following may be very well for theological students, but we hope they were not inflicted on children:

> But at the cost of setting a limited God upon the throne of the universe. Logically this is an absurdity, and a limited God could never be an object of worship.

The Bishop of Tinnevelly, better known at home as Stephen Neill, has published two series of Lectures delivered to Missionaries—*Beliefs* and *Foundation Beliefs* (U.S.C.L. & Lutterworth Press, 1s. 9d. each). They are admirably done, thoughtful and lucid, and throbbing with conviction. Only once do we feel that the Bishop turns aside from the road his argument leads: the reference, twice repeated, to those "who do not *yet* believe in the Virgin Birth", is not on his usual level. And we hope that readers will not spend long searching for the Noel Conrad he mentions: it is merely Conrad Noel. It almost looks as if the Bishop had been to see one of Noel Coward's plays the night before the Lecture in which this occurs was delivered.

We cannot give the same commendation to Dr. C. A. Alington's *Christianity in England* (Oxford Press, 4s.) as we did to his *Christian Outlines,* but we acknowledge that he set himself an impossible task. Selection and proportion are the tests which must be applied, and we cannot see why out of 180 pp. Polycarp should get two (Tertullian and Origen are not mentioned); Baxter has two to three pages, but Milton not a word; Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, has a page, but there is nothing about his contemporary, Philip Doddridge. The Dean confesses that his Anglican allegiance has influenced his choice of episodes, but to call Laud's execution a "brutal murder, perhaps the greatest crime in history", suggests more than loyalty to a Church; after all, there were nearly 300 martyrs in Mary's reign (though we are told nothing of John Foxe), and Congregationalism, of which the Dean has some strange ideas, had its martyrs in 1593; Lancelot Andrewes, one of Dr. Alington's heroes, visited them in prison and extolled to them the beauties of a life of meditation. We also learn that "The weakness of Puritanism came from its close association with Calvinism": "weakness" is the word.

Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke has done much to make the S.P.C.K. a great instrument of Christian propaganda. In *Teaching Sermons* (S.P.C.K., 4s.) he gives us outlines for a whole year for the stimulus of those who preach sermons as well as the education of those who hear them.

It is good to have in print the series of broadcast talks, *How Christians Worship* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), for Christians are still shockingly ignorant about each other's worship. The Rev. J. Eric Fenn writes an Introduction, and between the Archbishop of Canterbury's opening talk and the Dean of Lichfield's discussion of "wireless worship" there are contributions representing the Roman Catholic Church, the Churches of England and Scotland, the Free Churches, and the Quakers.

The Rev. R. A. Edwards has one of the best minds in the Anglican Church today, and his addresses, **The Church and the Modern World* (Methuen, 3s. 6d.), make a tract for the times. It is largely a reply to Prof. (why Professor?) Joad's query, "Will the world ever listen to you again?" Mr. Edwards outlines what it is that the Church has to say to the world and discusses whether the Church will be too late as it was at the time of Renaissance. He is, we think, rather better at diagnosis and criticism than at treatment and construction, but he is stimulating throughout. A line on p. 78 seems to have had a direct hit.

Dr. Andrew R. Osborn, an Australian Presbyterian now a minister in New York, is known in this country through his *Christian Ethics.* His *Christianity in Peril* (Oxford Press, 11s. 6d.) deals with "The New World Order and the Churches". Dr. Osborn does not pull his punches, and his picture of a Church which is outmoded and has lost faith and initiative is

indeed a sombre one. Yet there is a divine power working in history, and of this the Church should be the instrument. The Roman Church is so fettered by tradition that it cannot meet "the crisis of our age". Protestantism can, but it must regain intellectual and moral leadership, scrapping its obsolete methods of propaganda, education, and social service. Here are his concluding words:

> Even if organized Christianity as we know it collapsed altogether, the Spirit of God would create new media for its expression, but in the meantime the world would pass again into the Dark Ages. There exists a state of unlimited spiritual emergency: what will the Christian churches do?

There have been some first-rate books in the "Current Problems" series (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.), and Dr. H. G. Wood's Cambridge Lectures, *Christianity and Civilisation,* deserves to rank with them. He argues that what is best in our civilization—the conceptions of Liberty, Justice, Mercy, and Truth are being discarded. They came from Greece and Palestine, and were enriched by Christianity. Scientific humanism and the Marxist philosophy may serve to strengthen the love of truth or of justice, but the four conceptions together can only be maintained through a Christian co-operative commonwealth, resting on the revelation which centres in the Cross of Christ. Dr. Wood develops his thesis with many an apt literary allusion and sometimes with a saucy wit.

"Pattern" is a word much in vogue in the United States just now, and Dean Lynn Harold Hough, who has been a welcome visitor to our country this summer, uses it with effect in a volume of lectures which has just reached us. The chapters in *Patterns of the Mind* (Harpers, $1.50) are The Man Who Has No Pattern; The Man Who Does Not Know How to Use a Pattern; The Man Who Has a False Pattern; The Man Who Has an Incomplete Pattern; The Christian Pattern. Dean Hough develops his theme with his usual felicity of phrase and of illustration, and the result is a very suggestive little book.

**Midnight Hour* (Faber, 8s. 6d.) is the journal of one Nicodemus, kept from 1st May to 30th Sep., 1941, its title being taken from Kierkegaard's "There comes a midnight hour when all men must unmask". The writer's life outwardly had collapsed, and he was experiencing "the dark night of the soul". Amid much struggle he learnt that he must be still to know God, and through much tribulation he at last saw the gate of the Kingdom of Heaven. How the gate he glimpsed was closed to him we relate in the Editorial, but no doubt by this time he has learnt that there are other gates into the city. At first we get the impression of a man too immersed in his own concerns, but he himself insists that his conflict was no mere psychosis. no *crise de nerfs*. Whether he is right here or not we do not presume to say, but the intensity of his struggle is apparent. He is a sensitive soul, widely read, and with a mystical experience altogether unusual. He can write, too; if it is impossible to read his journal quickly, it is because we are made to stop on almost every page to ponder or to argue. Most readers should be better men for reading the story of this man's pilgrimage, and if a preacher does not get a dozen sermons out of it he is dull indeed.

From John Murray come two books which many will find helpful. In *Rendezvous* (2s. 6d.) the Rev. W. H. Elliott speaks out of his own experience of bereavement to those in like case. Sir Francis Younghusband's *Wedding* (2s.) is a strange mixture in which a spiritual view of marriage is combined with practical counsel about sex; the use of contraceptives is

deplored: an interesting account of the Baiga people is marred by a misprint on p. 3.

It is to be feared that the extravagant claims which Dr. (it is not made clear in what Faculty) F. W. Bailes makes for mental healing will prevent some of his soberer contentions in *Your Mind Can Heal You* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) from receiving consideration. For example:

> There are millions of instances in which, without any material intervention at all, and solely through intelligent co-operation with the Law of Mind, people have been completely and permanently healed of such conditions as cancer, arthritis, paralysis, high blood pressure, heart trouble, anemia, ulcers, gall-stones, nervous exhaustion, diabetes —indeed every form of distortion from which man apparently suffers.

Millions. Strange that we have met so few of them. Yet we recognize the effect of mental states on health, and man's failure to use spiritual forces in healing (here the Church has been sadly remiss). Dr. Bailes, who claims to have healed himself of diabetes and to have effected cures on people halfway round the world, has much to say that gives us pause, and the attitude to his book should not be one of cynical disbelief.

Prof. Otto A. Piper's *The Christian Interpretation of Sex* (Nisbet, 10s. 6d.) is a difficult book to assess—satisfying as it is in parts, and just as unsatisfying in others: the bibliography, *e.g.*, is typical, being *very* select, but with useful annotations. Had Prof. Piper called his book "The Biblical Teaching on Sex" there could have been few complaints: then the last chapters, on Sin, Forgiveness, and "Life in Truth", would not have seemed so strangely irrelevant as now they do. The general attitude is Lutheran, with indebtedness to Brunner (not in the bibliography), but Prof. Piper's comments on surplus women and delayed marriage for economic reasons show that he is far from being hide-bound. His treatment, however, is vitiated by his conviction, repeated probably twenty times, that first intercourse not only "unveils the inner secret of physical existence" and "solves, once and for all, the enigma of one's physical being", but that it sets up a permanent relationship and binds two persons together for life. Much as we might wish this to be so, we cannot escape the fact that for thousands of people it does nothing of the kind. Prof. Piper does not seem to have known any people promiscuous in their sex relationships, to whom intercourse is no more of an episode than attending a concert. His reiteration of this contention will, we fear, prevent his book from having the attention it deserves. It loses also by statements that are either trite or carry their own refutation with them:

> Selfishness does not lead to happiness in marriage.
>
> Marriages are truly made in heaven: the principle holds good without exception. That the persons concerned sometimes make a hell out of their marriage is no disproof.

The Report of the Proceedings at the Church Unity Octave (Blackwell, 5s.), arranged by the Dominicans in Oxford last January, makes interesting reading. A Roman and a non-Roman spoke to each "Intention": the only Congregationalist present seems to have been Dr. N. Micklem, who opened the discussion ("our long and miserable divisions") on Prof. H. F. Davis's paper, "Christ in Nonconformist Spirituality", which dealt mainly, and suggestively, with the Methodists. The "Intentions" were Church Unity, "The Eastern Churches", "The Church of England", "The Protestant Religion", "Lapsed Christians", "The Jews", "Islam", "The

Heathen" (note the clever separation made between the Church of England and Protestantism).

Are Friends a Church? What do they believe? What is their attitude to Christian Union? What is the meaning of the "Inner Light"? These and similar questions are clearly and adequately answered in Mr. Percy W. Bartlett's *Quakers and the Christian Church* (Friends' Book Centre, 1s. 6d.). The Swarthmore Lecture for 1942 is *The Law of Liberty* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.), by Margaret M. Harvey.

For once in a way a jacket's description cannot be bettered: Dr. L. E. Elliott-Binns's **Reconstruction: The Church's Part* (Muller, 5s.)

> attempts to answer, in a clear and simple way, four urgent questions of the day. (a) Ought the Church to intervene in political and social matters? (b) If so, what matters are suitable? (c) What form should the Church's activities take? (d) What are the Church's own needs if its intervention is to be effective?

The book succeeds in what it attempts, and it should be read by all concerned with present controversies about the Church's relationship to politics and the social order.

The increased attention to Milton in recent months is not without significance. Mr. C. S. Lewis breaks new ground in *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), a book which is as successful as *The Screwtape Letters*. Mr. Lewis has a brilliant pen, and his championship of *Paradise Lost*, reflecting keen insight and exhibited in flashing swordplay, should do much to lighten the darkness of Archbishops and others. It would be hard to find anything more successful in its way than the raillery of Mr. T. S. Eliot in the chapter "Is Criticism Possible?" We shall read Mr. Lewis again, as we shall another Milton book, Mr. G. Wilson Knight's *Chariot of Wrath* (Faber, 10s. 6d.), worth while for its quotations alone: the extracts from the *Second Defence* about "the campaign of peace" printed in his concluding pages should be circulated in every home. This does not mean that we are happy about Mr. Knight's methods: to use "the next four centuries ["four", Mr. Knight? But then you call David Masson "Henry"] of our history as an interpretative medium" seems dangerous, and we shrink from equating Milton's Messiah with the British Commonwealth, even with "the Crown of our constitutional Monarchy". Nevertheless, if the idea of a chosen nation serves to make the British people realize the immense responsibility which rests upon them in peace as in war its advocacy should do good. And throughout Mr. Knight compels thought.

In *Gerard Manley Hopkins, Priest and Poet* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.) Dr. John Pick expounds the thesis that Hopkins's poetry is, in Father D'Arcy's words,

> a loving regard of God and His creatures in the light of the Exercises of Ignatius and the sacramental doctrine of the Church.

Dr. Pick does show the part the Exercises played in Hopkins's far from happy life; strange it is that he never secured peace and joy in his efforts at sacrifice or in his work. It is not surprising to learn that he was a failure —"mediocre success" to Dr. Pick's kind eyes—as a preacher: there, as in his notes on the Exercises ("He uses almost a new language and doesn't provide a dictionary") and in his poems, he simply could not make himself clear. It is a pity that Hopkins was not steeped in the Authorized Version: there he would have found adequate vocabulary and a simplicity his elaborately patterned and variegated poems never reached: even in the poems Dr. Pick quotes here, four lines of commentary are needed to ex-

plain what one phrase of tortured, telescoped, inverted and sometimes invented language means. Dr. Pick does not discuss Hopkins's indebtedness to any of his predecessors: probably Browning was far too much of a Protestant for Dr. Pick to think a Jesuit might be indebted to him! Time and again in reading the poems they have seemed like attempts to copy, almost parody, the healthy optimist who also could be obscure, but who knew how to sing!

Mr. J. H. Hexter's *The Reign of King Pym* (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 15s. 6d.) has proved of great interest from more than one point of view. It is very American, from its phraseology—"sick" against our "ill", "heaving rocks" for "throwing stones", and "get around to" for "reach the point of"—to the forthrightness of its judgments. There is a crispness too about it which is American, and many a memorable sentence:

> Puritanism had a pedigree at least as long as Anglicanism.
>
> It is not unusual for a time of political ferment and disruption to prepare the way for a time when men are ready to pay the price of peace with the coin of liberty.

Mr. Hexter's thesis is that Pym, by his dexterous parliamentary craftsmanship, made Parliament "a relatively mobile and efficient instrument capable of waging war"; leader of the middle party, he used war and peace parties in turn to secure his ends; he was a practical politician, and we look in vain for his theories, his ideals, his aims; nevertheless,

> Parliament owed the substance, though not the form, of its ultimate success to the series of dull ordinances that John Pym wrote on the record in the first year of the Civil War.

A competent piece of work, with useful bibliography.

The first impression on beginning Miss Jane Lane's *King James the Last* (Dakers, 12s. 6d.) was to advise readers they should waste no time on such a display of prejudice masquerading as history. James is the brave, noble, devout, conscientious believer in Kingship, toleration, and God; William of Orange is a double-dyed villain, while "the Oligarchy", who defeated both James and William, are greedy and presumptuous rascals. Two illustrations of Miss Lane's attitude may be given: (1) Macaulay does not appear in the bibliography and only once in the narrative; (2) She believes that "Religious toleration was a thing favoured by all his [James's] family from Mary Queen of Scots onwards"!!! True, on the very next page she admits that Charles II could conveniently forget the Treaty of Breda, with its promise of toleration; but consistency does not trouble Miss Lane.

And yet the book ought to be read, and not merely to show the lengths pious prejudice can go. For Miss Lane can write ("horrificness" is but a slip), and in her description of James's flight, and of his encounter with the Highlanders at St. Germain, she rises to great heigths.

Are English readers getting tired of Kierkegaard? Dr. Walter Lowrie certainly isn't, for he has made a new translation of *Fear and Trembling* (Princeton & Oxford Presses, 16s. 6d.: for 200 small pages), which is described as a "dialectical lyric" and "very nearly perfect". We have our doubts: few writers can survive the publication of all their fragments without some loss of reputation, and the various *réchauffés* of Kierkegaard's relationship with Regina become most unpalatable. *Fear and Trembling* is based upon Abraham's offering-up of Isaac. It recounts the story, has a panegyric upon Abraham, and then, after what is elegantly called a "preliminary expectoration", the discussion of three problems. Will anybody

be the wiser or the better, we ask, for this work? No doubt, as both Mr. Griffith and Dr. Moore point out, Kierkegaard has elements of genius and a message for our dark days, but they do not appear in this work.

And even before the above paragraph goes to press Dr. Lowrie has given us yet another translation—*Repetition* (Oxford Press, 14s.). Whether anyone will understand what the book is about, even after reading the text and the long Introduction, we very much doubt. The jacket says: "*Repetition* is a religious category; 'it is freedom itself' ". Even that does not seem very intelligible; Dr. Lowrie says, rightly, that all Kierkegaard's works "deal symbolically with his own experience", and this is again concerned with his unhappy love affair. That there are some penetrating comments on *Job* (yes, friend, you never know what is coming next) scarcely justifies the labour expended by translator and reader.

Miss Anne Holt has written a useful centenary sketch, *William Ellery Channing, 1780-1842* (Lindsey Press, 1s.). At times she writes carelessly, *e.g.*, "The great changes in his life were rather intellectual", or in calling the United States "a servile state", or in her references to Beecher. Apart from this, however, she has contrived in short compass to make the reader realize something of Channing's power and of his contribution to religious life and thought.

We have read no more readable biography than Mr. Ralph Straus's *Sala* (Constable, 18s.), written in a style entirely befitting its subject. It is, we hope, significant not merely of our own ignorance that until we enjoyed these pages we knew little more of Sala than his initials and had no recollection of reading any of his work: Sala's writings, that suggests, were mostly ephemeral, and he has left no permanent additions to letters. Sala tried fiction and biography, but recognized that his home was in Fleet St.; he has been called the inventor of journalese, but there was a personal touch about the thousands of articles he wrote. Mr. Straus says:

> His style might be florid (though such a good writer as E. V. Lucas could set out to model his own upon it), and his vocabulary could be heavy and sometimes eccentric, but his vignettes, if not always learned, were vivid, and if they often shewed a touch of crude sentimentality, so much was expected at the time.

Those who associated Sala's name with those of Dickens and Thackeray would be amazed at the obscurity into which he has shrunk. If he lives at all, it will be as first of the race of "special correspondents" and chronicler of some of the main events of his day. Mr. Straus pictures him as a *bon vivant*, often drunk and often quarrelsome and unreliable, capable of earning large sums yet generally in debt and dying in poverty, talented and generous, but with no principles or vital religion and therefore no anchorage.

Prof. John W. Harvey has rendered good service in preparing for the press John Henry Muirhead's *Recollections* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.), the full title of which is "Recollections by a Journeyman Philosopher on the Movements of Thought and Practice in His Time". The time was 84 years from 1855, during which Muirhead, after youth and early education in Glasgow, was at Balliol under Jowett, taught for a time in Glasgow University, played with the notion of becoming a minister and entered Manchester College (in London and Oxford), "emancipated" himself from religious faith and gave himself to "ethical culture", and taught in London Colleges before settling down to his life work as Professor of Philosophy at the new University of Birmingham. The book is packed with good things, for Muirhead could write pleasantly; about Edward Caird, his contemporaries at Balliol, Joseph

Chamberlain, and many others he has much that is interesting to say. And the interest does not lessen when Prof. Harvey takes up the story to tell of the years of retirement. Muirhead had a real Indian summer, beginning a new life (and a new marriage) first teaching in California and then in a new Sussex home. He was an attractive figure, and this volume makes a real contribution to the understanding of an important period in English educational development.

In *Octavia Hill* (Constable, 15s.) Miss E. Moberly Bell has written a fitting biography of one of the great women of the Victorian age, one who

> had been a pioneer in woman's work, had indeed invented a profession for women, had worked on equal terms with men, sitting on Royal Commissions, advising Cabinet ministers and peers, and had again and again proved herself far ahead of her own generation.

Few who enjoy the lands and buildings administered by the National Trust remember that it is to Octavia Hill their debt is due, and in these days of "planning" few appreciate her emphasis on personal service and on the value of the individual. Socialists and Christians alike would do well to give the widest application to her dictum:

> If the poor are to be raised to a permanently better position, they must be dealt with as individuals and by individuals.

Democracy will only redeem itself when it cherishes the independence of the individual as did this pioneer self-sacrificing woman. There is a slip on p. 267.

Miss Helen Iswolsky is the daughter of the Russian statesman and ambassador. Russian by birth, French by adoption, she describes her life and work in Paris between the wars in a volume *Light Before Dusk* (Longmans, 15s.). The sub-title, "A Russian Catholic in France, 1923-41", suggests the contents of the book. A member of the Orthodox Church who has become a Roman Catholic, one of Miss Iswolsky's main interests is "the Union", *i.e.*, between Orthodox and Catholic, and she already speaks of the Orthodox as "our separated brethren". There is much else that is *naïve—e.g.*, the assumption that the Russian Church, the exponent of pure religion, stood for religion alone against an atheistic communism which apparently had no redeeming points, or that St. Theresa fills the gasoline tank of a Russian taxi-driver on a lonely road in answer to prayer.

M. Jacques Maritain is Miss Iswolsky's hero, and her account of her association with him and with Berdiaev are the most instructive parts of the book, though the description of her escape from Paris is the most vivid. Protestants would be well-advised to study the growth of Catholic social action, and especially its youth movements, such as the *J.O.C.* P. 217 is disfigured by "independant", repeating a mistake on p. 191.

Once you can overcome its "Convention" terminology, you can get as much inspiration from Mr. Norman Grubb's *Alfred Buxton* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) as from his *C. T. Studd*, although Mr. Grubb is so anxious to get the Second Coming into his concluding pages that his spelling several times goes "wonky"! Buxton was Studd's son-in-law and had Studd's faith and pioneering spirit. He began his missionary work at the age of 21, and gave his life to Africa, though he was killed in London during an air-raid in 1940.

Music is the link between Christopher Benn and Walford Davies, whose memoirs are published during the same week. The first was young, just beginning a life full of promise when he was killed on service with the 8th Army; the second had secured a world-wide reputation before he died in

his seventies. Captain John Benn's life of his brother, *I Say Rejoice* (Faber, 6s.), reveals a young man with keen religious faith and a conscience which drove him to active service, a good speaker, already noticed for his work at the Bar, a lover of nature and of music, happily married and with a little son. We can ill afford to lose such as he. This fraternal appreciation is well done. And so is Mr. H. C. Colles's *Walford Davies* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), as perfect a piece of biography as we have seen in many a long day. Mr. Colles has the necessary musical knowledge, a crisp style, and a sympathy with his subject which does not prevent him from taking an objective view. We thus learn how irritating Walford Davies could be as well as learning about the charm of his personality and his marvellous gift for getting the musical best out of schoolchildren and ordinary people. We see, too, that the son of the Congregational organist at Oswestry carried a Free Church *ethos* with him even at Windsor and as Master of the King's Musick, and that with his immense radio popularity there went fads and foibles of different kinds. Most people think of Walford Davies as one to whom success came easily. Mr. Colles shows that it was not so; there were failures in examinations and as a composer, and at times the fight was strenuous. Thousands who enjoyed "Walford" on the wireless will be grateful for this skilful—and well-illustrated—book.

Mrs. E. O. Lorimer is nothing if not vigorous: sometimes, indeed, she is so vigorous that we fear she is about to lose her balance. Nevertheless the main argument of *What The German Needs* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) will long be needed, for many (and not only the appeasers Mrs. Lorimer belabours) seem already to have forgotten Germany's deliberate campaign of lies (it is good to have again Hitler's speech welcoming home the warriors who had never been sent to Spain!) and her reiterated laudation of war. After the war the German will need discipline above all, for it is discipline he best understands; there must be a well-organized "Truth Service", to which Germans, young and old, must be obliged to listen; hungry Poles and Greeks must be fed first and the Germans must wait; and German labour-gangs must rebuild the cities they have damaged outside Germany before their own rebuilding begins.

The title of Count Carlo Sforza's *The Totalitarian War and After* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) should have been *How Right I Was*, words he uses on p. 74. There is little that is new in these notes by the former Foreign Minister of Italy, now in the United States, although we learn that in Paris in August, 1939, he recommended French Cabinet Ministers to insist that Mussolini decide for or against France in 48 hours, asking for two or three cities in Piedmont as security if he said "neutrality"; such a demand, he said, would have meant the fall of Mussolini within a week. The Count is a lover of his country, for which he is to be honoured; but can it be maintained, not only that Italy is a great nation, with an excellent colonizing record, but that Italians have always been, with occasional aberrations, wise and just, brave and courageous?

Mr. Gustav Winter, the author of *This is not the end of France* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), is a Czechoslovak, but we are not told whether the work was written in English or translated: "Reynaud and Mandel had been made amenable to yet another instance" is one of the very few sentences which suggest that the writer is not using his own language. Mr. Winter has a sad story to tell of the France between the wars, when all classes, and civilians and military alike, seemed doped. A special commission just before the war declared that

> progress of a technical character has, in the domain of tactics, not produced any substantial changes of the basic rules which were established by our predecessors.

A detailed memorandum on the Polish campaign sent by General Sikorski to General Gamelin was found unopened among the latter's papers. It is a woeful story, but Mr. Winter believes that the true France will survive, given the energy and firm will which have been lacking for twenty years: as he says:

> the present sufferings of France may serve as a health-giving purgatory which will bring her back to her true spiritual resources.

One of the most unfortunate appointments made by the Prime Minister was that of Mr. L. S. Amery as Secretary of State for India: Mr. Amery, like Mr. Churchill himself, had resisted the Indian demand for independence, and this meant he had to overcome an initial heavy handicap. It is well that his views should be made clear, and *India and Freedom* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) contains his speeches from assumption of office to the Cripps' Mission.

Mr. T. A. Raman's *India* is worthy of its place in the Oxford Press's "World To-day" series (3s. 6d.), and it is all the more welcome as coming from a Hindu. The survey of India's history would have been improved by more dates and a chronological table, and we are left wondering whether "short" means fifteen years or 150. "Laubach" is wrongly spelt on p. 172, and there are mysterious sentences: what, *e.g.*, is the force of the conjunction in this sentence:

> Babar was essentially a military genius, and his heart was always in the kindlier home he had left behind.

But all concerned with the bewildering problem India presents today will find the sketch of service.

North Africa is far from homogeneous, and in the same series Mr. Alan H. Brodrick had an impossible task in attempting to describe it. A land of long history and vast dimensions, now once again in the forefront of the stage of the world's history, cannot be handled in 100 pp. Mr. Brodrick has an unfortunate reference to India on p. 79 which will be joyfully seized upon by every enemy of Britain.

Dr. F. M. Keesing's *The South Seas in the Modern World* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is not only a timely book of reference which will prove—with its excellent Appendixes and imposing bibliography—indispensable to students; it also has some fascinating chapters about lands and peoples now in the forefront of the news. Population and race, agriculture and economics, health and education, government and missions—all are surveyed; the part played by the L.M.S. in the South Seas makes the missionary sections of especial interest. Some of the problems presented may be indicated in these quotations:

> Malaitan natives: "You white men give us orders; we no longer give orders to ourselves. . . . The white man has come and tells us that we must behave like *his* father. Our own fathers, we must forget them".
>
> The President of the Philippines: "Better a Philippines run like hell by Filipinos than made a heaven by outsiders".
>
> The greatly complicating factor in modern [educational] systems has been that the cultural heritage is in a state of flux, and they seek to train partly for what is and partly for what might be.
>
> Just when the Christianized communities were beginning to feel

> accustomed to their long Mother Hubbard dresses, white women began to parade before them in pyjamas and shorts. Where missions and governments were trying to impress on the people the desirability of a decorous home life, lurid dramas of sex and marriage were flashed upon the movie screens at the ports.

Men are so made that they are always writing Utopias. The latest of them is Viscount Samuel's *An Unknown Land* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), which we found good reading. The presumed writer believed the New Atlantis really existed, and set out to discover it. He succeeded, and the Isle of Bensalem is here described, with the surrounding islands, reminding us so much of European countries. The Bensals by the process of suturization have increased the size of their heads, and their mental capacity, and thus have a land devoid of acquisitive instincts, with neither wages nor profits nor capital. All assumed truths and dogmas are sifted, and the residue incorporated in *The Gist*, a slender volume. Though unknown to the rest of the world, Bensalem regularly sends disguised missioners on tours of observation. Occasionally Lord Samuel's hidden hand appears—in discussions of the Jews, Free Trade, *etc.*, but the sketch is stimulating throughout, though the introduction of the adjacent islands, with its obvious purpose of facilitating discussion of some modern States, strikes us as technically faulty.

It requires considerable will-power to resist the temptation offered by Prof. Gilbert Murray in *The Rape of the Locks* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). Fragments of papyri have furnished parts of Menander's comedy, *Perikeiromenê;* these Prof. Murray has translated and completed the play by his own additions. To distinguish Murray from Menander is an exercise we wish we had time to attempt.

The Circle of Life (Cape, 7s. 6d.) is the work of Mr. Kenneth Walker, a Harley Street surgeon; it is "A Search for an Attitude to Pain, Disease, Old Age, and Death". Mr. Walker writes with common sense about fear, pain, old age, rejuvenation, death and dying; he then examines ideas from Eastern religions and the theories of Dunne and Ouspensky. Chapters on "Doctors and Doctoring", "Surgery", and "Therapy" follow, the whole concluding with "The Two Worlds". From such a source a good word for Henry Drummond's now despised *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* is surprising, though it is in line with Mr. Walker's general outlook and his denial of Freud's materialism (he has a poor opinion of the clergy, nevertheless). He concludes that any large-scale survey of illness compels a belief that "all warring forms of life on the earth are but manifestations of a greater life", and that man

> either partakes in ever-increasing degree of his spiritual inheritance, or he identifies himself more and more with the world of organic life, the world of fear, pain, disease, of suffering, confusion, and death.

Misses Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham have written an account of their work in *Young Children in War-time in a Residential War Nursery* (Allen & Unwin, 1s. 6d.), a valuable collection of data and the conclusions thereon. Most readers will probably be surprised to learn that children suffer as much psychological harm from evacuation as from bombing.

Oxford has given us another fascinating autobiography, Mr. E. L. Woodward's *Short Journey* (Faber, 10s. 6d.). Mr. Woodward always writes well, and this account of his fifty years, in which he has turned his back, first on Orders and then on the Christian faith, we found both entrancing and stimulating. Education in London, Oxford, and Paris, the

War, All Souls, and the interlude between two Wars—these are the steps in the journey; whether he is describing what he sees, his companions, or his thoughts, Mr. Woodward invariably holds the attention. Many people will find the All Souls chapter of most interest, but that on "The Lost Generation" is most thought-provoking. Mr. Woodward thinks Liberalism had a great chance after the last war, but lost it. He well describes the situation of his generation:

> Our realization of the significance of this final assault upon the integrity of Western civilization cut us off from most of our elders. They were unable to realize what was happening, what indeed had happened. . . . We were hardly less cut off from the generation ten or fifteen years younger than ourselves. We had been brought up in an age of security. We could not forgo our belief in the reasonableness of the world. We carried with us through doubts and inquiries a conviction that human society could be established on a rational basis; we could not accept a defeatism of the intellect turned against itself.

Mr. Woodward's warning about Germany went unheeded; that he was right there makes the more encouraging the confidence in the future of England his knowledge of youth leads him to feel. On p. 90 a "1" has jumped up from "Salonika" to give us a weird word.

Mr. Sumner Welles writes, and apparently signs, the Foreword to Mr. Harold B. Hinton's *Cordell Hull* (Hurst & Blackett, 12s. 6d.), a biography of the American Secretary of State who has been content to labour behind the scenes while others took the limelight. Mr. Welles calls Mr. Hull "the least self-seeking man I know"; the thought of this quiet steadfast figure still in charge of foreign affairs gives confidence today both to the American people and their allies. Mr. Hinton tells the story well, if with some expressions unintelligible to Englishmen, who will nevertheless read of Mr. Hull's youth in Tennessee, his work as Judge, and his part in Democrat politics, with great interest. There are misprints on pp. 39, 102, 168.

The author appears in 17 of the 27 illustrations in Mr. George Bilainkin's *Diary of a Diplomatic Correspondent* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.). The diary is for the year 1940, during which Mr. Bilainkin married and left the Chelsea flat, where, apparently (p. 81), he had spent three and a half years in his bath, thinking and writing articles and telephoning all over Europe! This is an example of the carelessness with which the diary was written. Much of it, too, is small beer: we are told many times that Ambassador Kennedy called the writer "George". It is not until the "phoney war" is over that the comments of the diplomats, mostly minor, with whom Mr. Bilainkin mixed, become interesting. From May, 1940, to November, there are many sidelights on the eventful scene, and many *obiter dicta* by diplomatists on each other and on the situation. Some light is thrown on the Kennedy mystery; altogether the picture of British blundering and complacency is disquieting: here is the severe, though we cannot but think just, verdict on Neville Chamberlain:

> He represented trusting type of slightly travelled, under-educated Briton from provinces, who would have made competent chairman of county council. Cruel fate permitted him to become final arbiter of intricate foreign affairs policy of greatest commonwealth of nations. His futile journey to offer appeasement to an unwilling Mussolini; his act of gross discourtesy to Stalin in consenting to the dispatch by us of a junior expert in the Foreign Office to negotiate the vitally needed Anglo-French-Soviet military alliance with Foreign Minister Molotoff;

the amateur politician's naïve outburst about Hitler "missing the bus"; his irresponsible strain in broadcasting twice inside a fortnight "ten times more confidence in victory" when he, better than any one in Great Britain, must have known how criminally deficient were the Allies' war preparations in comparison with those of our enemies . . . these tragedies are likely to be posterity's epitaph to one who accepted and held the first post in the empire. The tragedies are also a warning to the nation that, if it wishes to survive, it must set its house in order, must begin by sifting claimants for high office by more critical standards than any hitherto followed.

Pp. 176 and 252 need attention.

Mr. H. J. Massingham's *Remembrance* (Batsford, 10s. 6d.) is an unusual biography. Well illustrated, as we should expect from a Batsford book, it tells of the author's gradual emancipation from the bonds of the town and his subjection to, infatuation for—it is difficult to find the right word—the countryside and the craftsmen, the soil and its denizens. It also tells of the writer's reaction from the dogmas of a Calvinistic nurse—his famous father left the children free to go their own way religiously—until, having swallowed Dr. R. H. Tawney wholesale on capitalism and Calvinism, he has entered "the Old Church—by the back door" while apparently retaining the right of private judgment and not becoming "a practising Catholic". Mr. Massingham's book is not easy to read, and some of his contentions, even about the land, difficult to accept. We can agree with him about the folly of "the idolatry of material progress", without believing that all phases of the application of science to agriculture are mistaken. Mr. Massingham has made a stalwart fight against physical disabilities, and wins our respect: we trust that his gloomy forebodings about soil-impoverishment will prove erroneous.

All interested in the land, in farming or gardening, will enjoy Mrs. Anne Blakemore's *Rich is My Heritage* (Lutterworth Press, 10s.). It tells how a newly-married couple bought an old Cotswold farm, with no intention of farming it; how gradually they stocked it, and the young wife's enthusiasm and inexperience led to losses; how her husband, a man of business, was gradually drawn into the ever-expanding work of the farm; how they went to sales, and from sheep went to pigs, and from pigs to cattle; and of how their children came and are learning to love the farm and its animals even as did their parents before them.

"Why is it", we have said many times in reading Mr. Sydney Walton's *From the White Cotiage* (Epworth Press, 5s.) "that these 'Letters in Wartime' do not make more appeal to us? They should, for we are interested in the same things as Mr. Walton—religion, books, men". The answer, we think, is that Mr. Walton admires Walter Pater, and there is an artificiality, a glitter, about his letters suggestive of Pater. Simplicity, directness, seem to us the essentials in all art in a time of blood and tears, and the least suggestion of the meretricious offends. Perhaps, however, Mr. Walton knew his correspondent—a young schoolmaster of Johannesburg—would appreciate adornment and literary allusion; if so, there are many things he would enjoy. But we do wish all the people—or nearly all—Mr. Walton mentions were not distinguished—eminent historians, Cabinet Ministers and the like! His book reminded us of some autobiographies we have read, or of the preacher who, apparently, converted only titled people or millionaires—all credit to him, for they probably needed converting, only need he so often have talked about it?

Miss Margaret Leech has a gift for description, and her *Reveille in Washington, 1861-1865* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 18s.) is well worth reading. Sometimes readers ignorant of the geography of Washington and its environs will find themselves in almost as much difficulty as Lincoln was with his long succession of incompetent generals, but they will win through as he did. Miss Leech well portrays life in the long threatened city, and once again we see how long a democracy takes before it can wage war efficiently. Lincoln and spies and assassins (but surely Booth is not to be compared with Brutus?), the difficult First Lady and the disreputable women who flocked to Washington in their thousands—these crowd the canvas, but stand out clearly. The illustrations are not so good as the text.

Somebody—perhaps Mr. Robert Birley, the editor of the volume before us—has conceived the excellent idea of publishing in the World's Classics (Oxford Press, 3s.) four volumes of *Speeches and Documents in American History*. This volume, the last of the four in time, though the first to be issued, deals with the years 1914 to 1939.

It was reported that George Stuart Gordon, having left a modern University for the splendours of Oxford, where he became President of Magdalen and Vice-Chancellor,

> then unto the ladder turned his back,
> Looked in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
> By which he did ascend.

If this were so, it were hard to forgive, but the very readable lectures on the Watson Foundation, *Anglo-American Literary Relations* (Oxford Press, 5s.), do much to wash out the stain: British ignorance of American literature is phenomenal, and, while these lectures do not deal with the present day, they lay a foundation on which knowledge can be built. The titles of the lectures indicate their scope, but not the charming manner of treatment: Early American Literature; The Rise of American Literature; Friendship in Letters; British Authors in America; British Authors' Copyright; The Literary Hopes of America.

There is much that is salutary in the Rev. R. O. Hall's *The Art of the Missionary* (S.C.M., 2s.)—"Fellow-workers with the Church in China"—but sometimes the Bishop is so "hearty" that he puts us off! The Methodist Sunday School Department has published (6d. each) two useful booklets: *The Shepherd Way* is a Manual for Workers among Young People; *At the Beginning of the Way* a Guide for those preparing for Membership in the Methodist Church. These should be contrasted with Mr. F. H. Drinkwater's illustrated *My Church Book* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) "for Children of First-Communion Age and After"; it includes greetings to the Saints and the Latin responses at Mass.

Leaders of Youth Groups will find much that is helpful in the Rev. Godfrey S. Pain's *Youth and the Gospel* (Epworth Press, 2s.), which includes an account of the Seventy Club at Carrs Lane, Birmingham, among many suggestions about aims and methods. It is a pity that the bibliography is so slapdash: one book appears twice, and the *Critical Introduction to the N.T.* is by "A. Peak": books for the young and their leaders ought to set an example in care and precision. *Myself and My Fellows* (Religious Education Press, 4s. 6d. & 4s.) is Vol. II of the Senior Lessons on the Agreed Syllabus, edited by Mr. E. H. Hayes and Dr. F. S. Popham.

Mr. E. H. Hayes's *Concise Guides* for 1943 are ready. There is one significant change: the Intermediate Guide (11-14) is now called *Senior*

Guide and the Senior (over 14) *The Young People's Concise Guide*. These, and the *Primary* and *Junior*, are 4s. 6d. each, the *Beginners'* is 3s. 6d., all from the R.E.P., which also issues the *Scholars' Papers* (Beginners, Primary, Junior; 1s. 6d. each yearly).

The indefatigable Mr. Sid G. Hedges has produced another useful book, *Youth Club Games and Contests* (Methuen, 4s.), for which leaders will pray blessings upon his head. The suggested playlets are good, and in his questions Mr. Hedges makes few mistakes, though we have Jane Austin, and some people would definitely not agree that Carey was the first great missionary to India.

Young Offenders (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) is the report of a recent Home Office "Enquiry into Juvenile Delinquency" conducted by Drs. A. M. Carr-Saunders, Hermann Mannheim, and E. C. Rhodes. The conclusions have already been published; this volume describes previous surveys, outlines the methods adopted in the present one, and analyses the information received; it should have the attention of all engaged in work among adolescents.

There is good value in the Rev. J. W. James's *The Black Mark* (Indep. Press, 2s.), containing, as it does, twenty addresses to boys and girls.

Mr. A. C. Ward's anthology, *Grim and Gay* (Oxford Press, 6s.), is said to be "heroic, dramatic, comic". "Gay" and "comic" could well have been omitted, for there is little of the kind to be found; as, indeed, Mr. Ward seems to recognize, for his Introduction says, "Endurance is the major theme". There are some stirring items illustrating the courage and devotion of men through many centuries.

We should have been glad had it been possible to say that Mr. Peter Abrahams's *Dark Testament* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) contained anything more than promising short sketches and a fragment of a novel. Mr. Abrahams is a young African, the son of an Abyssinian father and a half-caste mother; he has had experience of hunger and poverty, and his work expresses the bitter, fierce indignation of one resenting the superiority of the white man. The hard lot of coloured man and of Jew is portrayed in stories some of which are not lacking in power. But Mr. Abrahams has not learnt how to reject—and that must be his next task.

Miss Eileen Marsh's *We Lived in London* (Lutterworth Press, 8s. 6d.) describes the life of a London family from the outbreak of war in 1939: Dad, in the Navy in the last war, his wife and her mother, a large family with their attachments—and then bombings, enlistments, leaves, casualties, *affaires*, tragedies. If the family has perhaps more than the average of troubles—five of three generations killed by bombing—yet the picture of a London working-class home on the whole rings true.

Mr. George Wolfenden's *The Little Doves of Destruction* (Hurst & Blackett, 8s. 6d.) is an exciting spy story, with a baby and her mother as the heroines. It is not exactly the book to read in the black-out or during a raid, but will serve admirably for a railway journey.

EDITOR.

Mr. Sholem Asch is a very modern Jew, and as such has a real claim on the interest and sympathy of Christians. His latest book, **My Personal Faith* (Routledge, 8s. 6d.), like all that he has written, shows him to be at once a fine creative artist and a devout and even God-intoxicated man. He has the qualities both of the prophet and of the rabbi, a real religious insight and conviction, on the one hand, and a careful and scholarly inter-

pretation, on the other. Thus in the first five chapters we have a very beautiful and moving description of the writer's fundamental faith. It may be summed up in the following simple confession:

> God is not a God of miracles but a God of our daily lives. Faith in God is not unveiled in fantastic incidents, but in the ordinary course of our daily existence. We seek God and we find him in every moment of our being, and we see the guiding hand of God in every ordinary event. And we believe that everything God does for us is for our good.

In the next ten chapters of the book Mr. Asch writes more definitely as a Jew and discusses very frankly and yet without a trace of bitterness the whole issue as between Jews and Christians. He has a profound reverence for Jesus Christ. He was a prophet indeed, the last and perhaps the greatest of them, and His followers need to understand better than they often do how deep is the debt they owe to the Judaism mediated to them in the teaching of Jesus and through the work of His followers, Peter, James, and Paul. It is good sometimes to see ourselves as others see us, and Mr. Asch's objective treatment of the relations between Jews and Christians throughout the ages brings home in a very vivid way the shame of the persecution of Jews by so-called Christians. It is impossible to read this book without realizing that we have all much to learn from this great people, and more in common with them than we think, especially in these evil days. As our author says:

> The time of terror has sharpened in all of us our awareness of our common source of life. It is my hope that the closer community established in pain will be our reward in the days of our liberation.

The book has been admirably translated by Mr. Maurice Samuel.

There is some "fine confused feeding" in Dr. Ranyard West's *Conscience and Society* (Methuen, 15s.). The book is further described as "a study of the Psychological pre-requisites of law and order" and well illustrates its author's belief in the capacity of psychology not only to account for our existing social order but also to remedy its defects. It is therefore by way of contrast that Dr. West begins his investigation with an account and criticism of certain philosophical writers on human nature and its social relationships, chief among them being Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. Their deficiencies leave room for the more intimate and experimental treatment of the subject by psychologists. In this connexion Dr. West gives a detailed and very critical analysis of Freud's sociological theories, contrasting them with those of Suttie and others. Then comes the more positive and constructive part of the book dealing with a psychological theory of law both national and international, the emotion of loyalty and the manipulation of world forces in order to attain world law. It is all very interesting and very relevant to our present distress. But it leaves the reader wondering where to find the dynamic which will make the new order possible and effective. Control of the aggressive instincts is not easily attained, and Dr. West's theory of conscience hardly seems equal to the task. He has little or nothing to say about religion, though it would seem to be a force to be reckoned with in any account of man's social behaviour. But as a study in applied psychology this book is well worth reading, especially by those who are concerned to lay well and truly the foundations of a new social order.

In *Time and the Timeless* (Centenary Press, 5s.) Miss Rosalind Murray discusses the age-long problem presented by the double nature of man—a

being living in time but with eternity in his heart. Her book may not unfairly be regarded as a sequel to *The Good Pagan's Failure*. It seeks to defend Catholic orthodoxy against the acids of modernity, and contains some very shrewd if rather prejudiced criticisms of the present calamitous world order. The big question of the relation between time and eternity as raised by the title of the book is only very superficially dealt with, and is used rather as an excuse for attacking materialism in all its forms and for vindicating the spiritual nature and outlook of man. Miss Murray writes well, though some of her historical judgments are open to question. Most readers, however, will probably agree with her conclusion that, as between humanism on the one hand and a stark materialism on the other,

> the middle way of Christian orthodoxy offers, as always, the balanced solution, the synthesis of the truths that each view contains, the harmony of a world saved through the incarnation, matter redeemed through spirit, time through eternity, man through God: but it demands more personal effort than Humanism, a more absolute recognition of weakness than the defeatist: it is more uncompromising and more totalitarian than either form of proffered alternative.

The scientific study of sociology has made great progress of late, and will undoubtedly play a part in the process of reconstruction after the war. There should therefore be a very warm welcome for Dr. H. A. Mess's **Social Structure* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.). Dr. Mess is a recognized authority on the subject, and he has produced an invaluable textbook for the guidance of the ordinary man who seeks to study the problem of social relations. The book is clearly and simply written, contains abundant suggestions for further study, and holds the reader's interest from first to last. Though comparatively brief, it covers a great deal of ground. Among the subjects discussed are the nature of society, its biological and psychological bases, and the part played in it by ideas, heritage, government, religion, education, and geography. On all these matters Dr. Mess has something fresh and pertinent to say; he leaves with his readers the impression of a man who knows what he is talking about and loves what he knows. His book is an admirable introduction to a difficult and complicated subject.

W. B. SELBIE.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

Freedom, Truth and Peace (Oxford Press, 6d.) is a Commemoration Sermon by the Archbishop of Canterbury preached at Oxford last June. Many to whom Rendel Harris meant much will welcome *The Life Indeed* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.), selections from his devotional writings made by Mr. W. G. Hanson: Dr. J. A. Findlay prefixes a "personal tribute". Prof. T. E. Jessop's **Science and the Spiritual* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.) contains four lectures delivered at Bangor made into a Christian News-Letter Book, and a very suggestive book too. Prof. Jessop examines

> the non-natural status of the ideal, to prove the validity of its claim, and to show that it announces the possibility of a supernatural order, that human life functioning on its distinctive plane exhibits the actualization of such an order . . . [and postulates] a universe in which a Spirit is supreme.

Two interesting F.B.A. papers (Oxford Press, 2s. & 3s.) are Dr. J. H. Clapham's *Lord Stamp* and Prof. J. L. Myres's *Sir Arthur Evans*, which is twice as long and—we almost wrote "therefore"—only half as good. A third appreciation, Mr. W. G. de Burgh's *George Dawes Hicks, 1862-1941* (3s.) will be found interesting by philosophers as an exposition of Hicks's

teaching. Also from the Academy *Proceedings* is Dr. A. G. Little's *An Illuminated Letter of Fraternity* (1s.), an account of a document, probably not the original, dated 1407. Prof. R. W. Chambers's Warton Lecture, *Poets and their Critics: Langland and Milton* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), is as welcome and as readable as it is learned and convincing. We are specially glad to have so powerful a refutation of the charge of fraud brought against Milton in respect of the "Pamela-prayer". Mr. A. G. Tansley's *The Value of Science to Humanity* (Allen & Unwin, 1s. 6d.) is the Herbert Spencer Lecture for 1942. Dr. E. T. Whittaker's *The Beginning and End of the World* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.) is the Riddell Memorial Lecture. *Life in the Army* (Oxford Press, 6d.) is a straight talk to troops by Dr. W. D. Maxwell, author of *An Outline of Christian Worship*, now an Army Chaplain. The Livingstone Press has issued some useful Prayer and Preparation Notes for *The New Advance* (2d.), Nos. 9 and 10 of "World Issues" (3d.)—Miss Margery Perham's *The Colonies* and Mr. C. J. Stranks's *Japan Today*, Miss Joyce Reason's *Tales from James Chalmers* (Livingstone Press, 3s. 6d.), with coloured illustrations, and the Rev. F. H. Ballard's *News for the World* (8d.), "Chapters in the Expansion of Christianity". The Oxford Press continues its war brochures: Miss Violet Conolly's *Soviet Russia* (4d.) is in the "World Affairs" series; there are four more, with Mr. Charles Siepmann's *Radio in War-time* noteworthy, in "America Faces the War" (6d.), and three in French, for "La France Combattante".

Dr. Maldwyn L. Edwards's *Adam Clarke* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.) is a very readable account of the life and work of the great commentator. Dr. John C. Heenan's broadcast talks, *Untruisms* (Burns, Oates, 1s. 6d.), are lively Christian apologetic by a Roman priest, addressed specially to those in the Forces: one of them deals with Eire and the War, another defends the attitude of the Pope.

ALSO RECEIVED.

FRED STAFFORD. *Prayers for Women's Meetings.* Independent Press. 1s. 6d. Commended by Mrs. Feeney, Secretary of the Federation of Congregational Women.

DOROTHY E. THOMPSON. *The Song and the Star.* R.E.P. 6d. A Christmas Play.

ARTHUR DAKIN. *William Carey.* Carey Press. 6d.

The "Friendship Calendar" of the L.M.S. is a familiar sight in Congregational homes. "1943" has some fine photographs (Livingstone Press, 2s.).

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn (October) arrived during the first week in December. We can forgive that, and the absence of ourselves from "Periodical Literature" once again, and "woulb", and other signs of stress, but we must protest against the doyen of our Editorial Board being called "Sulbie". [After that we expect half-a-dozen misprints in our own journal will be discovered!] There is a provocative article, "Unseasonable Truth", by the Rev. F. B. Harvey, a fine paper on Henry Vaughan by the Rev. W. L. Doughty, and a lively reply to the Rev. N. J. McLellan by the Rev. James Mackay.

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.). The earlier contributors are entangled in puzzles and paradoxes: Dr. Jacks discusses whether every day the war lasts brings the end nearer or makes it more remote, Mr. E. W. Hirst "The Golden Rule *versus* The Rights of Man", and Father Copleston "'Know Thyself'—But How?" The liveliest contribution is Dr. Lofthouse's "Retribution and Reformation", Dr. J. W. B. Worsley's attempt to emulate Sydney Smith being a flop. Father Bévenot concludes that Richard Hooker was as much a Protestant as Whitgift. Dr. Mellone surveys recent philosophical and theological literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (January and April). The troubles of editors may be indicated by the fact that these two numbers, bound in one, arrived on November 5th. Dr. Wheeler Robinson writes on "The Five Points of a Baptist's Faith", and the Rev. W. E. Hough on "The Message of John Oman". Dr. W. T. Whitley, the Rev. E. A. Payne, and the Rev. H. S. Curr are among the other contributors.

The Modern Churchman (September). This journal is now to appear once a quarter. Sir Walter Moberly's pamphlet on religious education influences quite a number of the articles. The Bishop of Truro writes on "Thomas Arnold's Contribution to Christian Problems of Today", Miss Dorothy M. Emmet on "Dr. Temple's Philosophy", the Editor on "Dogma Matters", and Mr. W. R. Niblett on "Christian Discovery".

The Evangelical Quarterly (October). Dr. R. J. Drummond opens with "A Comprehensive View of the Epistle to the Romans", the Rev. P. E. Hughes argues, though "argues" is scarcely the word, that "the virgin birth is an essential and indispensable factor" of the Christian faith, and Mr. F. F. Brace continues his useful "Aspects of Gospel Introduction". Prof. J. H. S. Burleigh has a fine tribute to that noble soul, Magister Jan Hus.

The Expository Times (September-December). Among the leading articles in these issues are Dr. A. J. Gossip's "Inspired English Translations", Miss Royden's "The Place of Women in the New Order", and the appreciation of George Adam Smith.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). Several articles deal with deceased Friends, notably Robert Henry Marsh and William Arthur Albright. John S. Hoyland writes on "The Men of the Resurrection" and Maude Robinson on "A Present Day Dragon" (the drink trade).

World Dominion (September-October). Congregational contributors are the Revs. L. B. Fletcher and Hilary Wilson. Dr. R. J. H. Cox's "Grim Portal to India" and the Rev. G. Hadjiantoniou's "Challenge of Modern Greece" are but two among many interesting articles. The Rev. Alex. McLeish's "Religion in Continental Europe" is valuable. (November-December.) The Rev. A. M. Chirgwin describes Madagascar and Mr. David Tutaeff the Caucasus.

The International Review of Missions (October). The Editor opens with a thoughtful study of "The Future of the Missionary Enterprise". Dr. Latourette on "Missions and Wars", Madame Gorodetzsky on "The Missionary Expansion of the Russian Orthodox Church", and the Rev. R. J. B. Moore on "The Development of the Conception of God in Central Africa" follow. The Book Reviews are useful.

The Knight Crusader (2s. 6 issues). "The organ of the Knights of the Order of the Cross—an international magazine produced by Youth". International in outlook, with some Esperanto. The Editorial of the October issue suggests that if the Editor blindly accepts statements from other papers youth may be no better led in the future than it has been in the past.

The Harvard Theological Review (July). The chief item is the text of the "Mormon Declaration of Rights", issued in 1845. We have also Mr. Harold Mattingly's "The Later Paganism", Dr. Graham Fristee's "Tennant's Struggle with a 'Desperate Task'" (the notion of a "limited God"—estimated as a failure), and Mr. Johannes Quasten's "Theodore of Mopuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium".

The Anglican Theological Review (April). Dr. J. A. Bewer is good on "Progressive Interpretation", Prof. F. C. Grant on "The Sermon on the Mount", and the Rev. G. C. Vincent on "The Individual and the Institution". Mr. H. R. Willoughby has an interesting illuminated article on "Hans Holbein and the Coverdale Title Borders of 1535 and 1539-41". (July.) There are several papers read at the Bishops' Conference on Theological Education, Dr. H. C. Robbins's examination of "Common Trends in Proposals for a Just and Durable Peace", Miss M. E. Andrews's "*Peirasmus*" and Dr. C. C. Richardson's "By What Authority?"

Religion and Life (Autumn). A good number. Two articles of special interest to English readers are Dr. D. S. Cairns's "Sir George Adam Smith" and Dr. William Paton's "William Temple". Perhaps the most important contribution is Dr. A. L. Warnshuis's "Group Conversion", but Dr. Poteat's "Hymns and the Ecumenical Movement", Dr. Trueblood's "The Place of Theology in a University", and Dr. Ferré's "A Theological Doctrine of Man" should be read. Two articles deal with current fiction.

The Review and Expositor (October). Almost a Carey number, four articles dealing with Baptist Missions. Again Dr. G. S. Dobbins contributes the most useful article, "The Problem of War-Time Adjustments" being informing and serviceable.

CORRESPONDENCE

ABOVE ALL LIBERTIES.

SIR,

I leave the readers of my *Above all Liberties* to judge the criticisms of the book made in your July issue. I should like, however, to ask what is

absurd about the title? It is an allusion, which I should have thought "every school boy" would recognize, to the celebrated passage from the *Areopagitica:* "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties".

The theme of the book is that the liberty claimed by Milton should not be denied to writers on sexual subjects.

Yours faithfully,
ALEC CRAIG.

[As a quotation from *Areopagitica* has adorned every issue of this journal it is at least probable that we knew of its existence. What seemed to us absurd about Mr. Craig's title was his seizure of a grand and glorious phrase to cover one tiny, and not very important, aspect of the subject.—ED.]

GUILTY GERMANS?

DEAR SIR,

Your criticism of my book *Guilty Germans?* is severe, though not venomous like that of one journal till recently pro-Nazi; and I take it the more seriously since I note with pleasure that you are clearly on our side of the Vansittart issue. But I would like to point out that my book specifically renounced any attempt to discuss British Imperial administration. You reprove me for not mentioning "significant facts like the restoration of self-government to the South African peoples". I do not know that South Africa is the happiest of examples; but my book does mention self-government in the Dominions, just as it condemns Boer Imperialism with our own, and finds, by the way, that the Boers rather than the British were guilty of the actual outbreak of the South African war. My book stressed the magnificent record of British doctors, missionaries, and administrators in India and showed that British democracy has been an example to the world. But the book does compare the aggressions of the Powers, selecting Germany, France, and Great Britain for some detailed treatment. To condemn French aggression is not to condemn France and the French; my book not only, as you say, dissociates Germany from the Nazis, but distinguishes between all peoples and their imperialistic governments. Until we learn to forget that we are British while we read our own history and that of other peoples we shall never read it correctly.

I am, Sir,
Yours very truly,
AUBREY DOUGLAS SMITH.

STIPENDS AND TAXES: TABLE*.

SHOWING INCOME LEFT AFTER PAYING TAX FOR A MARRIED MAN WITHOUT AND WITH 1, 2 OR 3 CHILDREN BOTH IN 1938/39 AND 1942/43 FOR VARIOUS INCOMES

INCOME ALL EARNED	MARRIED MAN WITHOUT CHILDREN		MARRIED MAN WITH 1 CHILD		MARRIED MAN WITH 2 CHILDREN		MARRIED MAN WITH 3 CHILDREN	
	1938/39	1942/43	1938/39	1942/43	1938/39	1942/43	1938/39	1942/43
£	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
150	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
175	175 0 0	169 6 3	175 0 0	175 0 0	175 0 0	175 0 0	175 0 0	175 0 0
200	200 0 0	187 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0
225	225 0 0	204 13 9	225 0 0	220 18 9	225 0 0	225 0 0	225 0 0	225 0 0
250	248 6 8	222 17 6	250 0 0	238 12 6	250 0 0	250 0 0	250 0 0	250 0 0
275	271 13 4	246 1 3	275 0 0	256 6 3	275 0 0	272 11 3	275 0 0	275 0 0
300	295 0 0	257 15 0	300 0 0	274 0 0	300 0 0	290 5 0	300 0 0	300 0 0
325	318 6 8	275 8 9	323 6 8	291 13 9	325 0 0	307 18 9	325 0 0	324 3 9
350	341 13 4	291 7 6	346 13 8	309 7 6	350 0 0	325 12 6	350 0 0	341 17 6
375	365 0 0	305 2 6	370 0 0	327 1 3	375 0 0	343 6 3	375 0 0	359 11 3
400	388 6 8	309 17 6	393 6 8	343 17 6	398 6 8	361 0 0	400 0 0	378 5 0

* We are indebted to Mr. F. P. Winterbotham, of Kensington Chapel, for this Table, illustrative of our reference to Stipends and Income Tax.